DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 264 744 HE 018 295

AUTHOR Chandler, Alice
TITLE Foreign Students and Government Policy: Britain, France, and Germany.
INSTITUTION American Council on Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY EXXON Education Foundation, New York, N.Y.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-8268-1478-6
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 78p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Council on Education, International Educational Publications, One Dupont Circle, Suite 801, Washington, DC 20036-1193 ($2.00 prepaid).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Access to Education; Admission Criteria; College Admission; *College Students; Developed Nations; Developing Nations; *Enrollment Trends; *Foreign Countries; *Foreign Students; Higher Education; *International Educational Exchange; *Public Policy; Student Costs; Student Mobility; Tuition
IDENTIFIERS *Europe; France; Great Britain; West Germany

ABSTRACT

The impact of European government policy on the movement of foreign students in Great Britain, France, and West Germany is discussed by a member of the American Council on Education Committee on Foreign Students. Foreign student enrollments have increased dramatically in these three countries in the 1960s and 1970s, and foreign students also make up a significant proportion of total student enrollments in each of the three countries. Britain and France heavily enroll students from former colonies. Each of the countries has experienced disproportionate enrollments from a limited number of foreign countries. Policies adopted for foreign students reflect, in part, the influence of immigration issues and attitudes toward ethnicity. Each of the countries has recently altered its policies to restrict and control the flow of foreign students, using tuition or entrance requirements. In 1980 Great Britain decided to impose full-cost fees on foreign students. One rationale for Germany's positive foreign student policies is the importance of strengthening the educational and technical capacity of underdeveloped countries in order to increase their buying power and to assist in achieving world peace. Foreign student policy is closely intertwined with a nation's educational policy and systems, economic conditions, demographic projections, internal social pressures, and foreign policy and foreign trade priorities. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FOREIGN STUDENTS AND GOVERNMENT POLICY: BRITAIN FRANCE AND GERMANY

by Alice Chandler

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ACE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

[ ] Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

ACE Board of Directors

Executive Committee

Ronald W. Roskens, President,
University of Nebraska, *Chair*

Philip H. Jordan, Jr., President,
Kenyon College, *Vice Chair*

The Reverend Timothy S. Healy, S.J.,
President, Georgetown University,
Immediate Past Chair

Jesse N. Stone, Jr., President,
Southern University, *Secretary*

Robert H. Atwell
American Council on Education, *President*

Benjamin F. Payton, President,
Tuskegee Institute

Stelle Feuers, President,
Los Angeles City College

Janet D. Greenwood, President,
Longwood College

Association Representatives

Robert V. Cramer, President,
Carroll College

The Reverend Charles Currie, S.J., President,
Xavier University

Roderick K. Daane, General Counsel,
University of Michigan

Judith S. Eaton, President,
Community College of Philadelphia

Brother Patrick Ellis, F.S.C., President,
LaSalle University

Carol J. Guardo, Provost,
University of Hartford

Joab M. Lesesne, Jr., President,
Wofford College

Aubrey K. Lucas, President,
University of Southern Mississippi

Prezell R. Robinson, President,
Saint Augustine's College

John W. Ryan, President,
Indiana University System

David C. Smith, Dean, College of Education
University of Florida

A.R. Sullivan, President,
Sullivan Junior College of Business

John S. Toll, President,
University of Maryland

Institutional Representatives

Class of 1985

Joseph Duffey, Chancellor,
University of Massachusetts at Amherst

Eamon M. Kelly, President,
Tulane University

Robert H. McCabe, President,
Miami-Dade Community College

Benjamin F. Payton, President,
Tuskegee Institute

W. Ann Reynolds, Chancellor,
California State University System

Joyce Tsunoda, Chancellor for Community
Colleges, University of Hawaii

Class of 1986

Harold W. Eickhoff, President,
Trenton State College

Stelle Feuers, President,
Los Angeles City College

Ira Michael Heyman, Chancellor,
University of California, Berkeley

Virginia L. Lester, President,
Mary Baldwin College

Frank H. T. Rhodes, President,
Cornell University

Bill F. Stewart, President,
Kirkwood Community College

Class of 1987

Roscoe C. Brown, Jr., President,
Bronx Community College,
City University of New York

William M. Fulkerson, Jr., President,
Adams State College

Janet D. Greenwood, President,
Longwood College

William J. Maxwell, President,
Jersey City State College

Patsy H. Sampson, President,
Stephens College

James J. Whalen, President,
Ithaca College

FOREIGN STUDENTS AND GOVERNMENT POLICY: BRITAIN FRANCE AND GERMANY

By
Alice Chandler
President
State University of New York
College at New Paltz

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
Washington, D.C.

© 1985 American Council on Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

Printed in the United States of America

First Printing
March 1985
ISBN 0-8268-1478-6

Copies of this book have been distributed to each member of the American Council on Education. Additional copies may be obtained at $2.00 per copy prepaid from International Education Publications, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 801, Washington, D.C. 20036-1193.

Table of Contents

Foreword, *by Robert H. Atwell* v

Preface vii

1. Great Britain: The Overseas Student and Full-Cost Fees 1
   Background • The Overseas Student Trust and the "Pym Package" • Development Assistance • Future Trends and Policies • Some Underlying Issues

2. France: The Evolution of Policy 19
   Background • Enrollment Trends and Tendencies • The Premises of Policy • Future Goals and Directions • Some Underlying Issues

3. Germany: Cosmopolitanism, Development, and Technology 31
   Enrollment Trends and Space Limitations • The Cost of Education • Educational Agencies In Bonn and West Berlin • Bonn • West Berlin • A Look At East Berlin • Directions In German Policy

4. Conclusions and Recommendations 49

Acknowledgements 57

Selected List of Works Consulted 59

Foreword

President Alice Chandler was a valued member of the ACE Committee on Foreign Students which issued the 1982 report on *Foreign Students and Institutional Policy*. That report brought a new perspective on European government policies which have an important impact on their foreign student enrollments. Subsequent discussions with colleagues in Europe convinced many of us in higher education of the significance of national government policy for the movement of foreign students to our respective countries. We agreed there was much to learn from others' experience. The ACE Report urged the development of a network with our counterparts in the Atlantic Community for the systematic sharing of information about policies and trends, and for discussion of matters of mutual concern.

We are fortunate that President Chandler could use her study leave to travel to Great Britain, France, and Germany for the purpose of talking with government, educational and private sector officials about their government policy and its impact on foreign students. This publication includes the report of that trip. It is an exceptionally fine analysis of the forces which determine government policy, the rationale for that policy, and its effects in these countries.

Educational exchange has become increasingly identified with a nation's foreign policy. The examples of Great Britain, France and Germany highlight the ways in which each of these countries pursues its policy in light of its national interest. I believe this report will be of interest to members of Congress and officials in the Executive Branch who have interest in and responsibility for educational exchange. The higher education community will also benefit from a careful reading of the report.

The American Council on Education is grateful to the Ford Foundation for a grant to our international division which supported

Alice Chandler's trip, and to the Exxon Education Foundation for a grant to support printing and distribution of this report. We acknowledge as well th generous support and assistance President Chandler received from the British Council, the German Academic Exchange Service, and the French Fulbright Commission.

Alice Chandler is a member of the ACE Commission on International Education. She is an articulate advocate for the value of higher educational exchange and for the importance of sound exchange policy in higher education institutions. She is concerned that educational leaders engage in regular dialogue on this issue with government and corporate leaders, and with our counterparts abroad. We are grateful for her insights and her rich reporting of exchange policies. We hope that her report will set the stage for future dialogue on educational exchange.

Robert H. Atwell
President

Preface

From a global perspective, the increase in the number of international students over the past twenty years has been extraordinary. In 1960 the total number of foreign students around the world was roughly 250,000. Today it is more than one million. Although the total number being educated abroad is small in relation to all students engaged in higher education, the cumulative effect of foreign students on the limited group of nations in which they mainly choose to study is very great. Their presence in large numbers has a direct impact on the educational systems of the half-dozen major receiving nations (the United States, France, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, Canada, and the Soviet Union). It also has an indirect impact on at least two other key areas of national policy: foreign relations and foreign trade. Few of the returning foreign students will become actual heads of government or leaders of industry. They will, however, be heavily represented in that cohort of well-trained individuals who constitute the diplomats and bureaucrats, managers and administrators, educators and technologists of the countries to which they return. As such, their influence, if not *as* policymakers, then *on* policymakers is incalculable. The intertwined network of transnational and national companies—of buyers, traders, and sellers—depends on them and on their preferences and predilections among nations and economic systems. So also does that vast infrastructure of civil servants and technocrats who operate the modern state and who frequently outlast, and sometimes even outweigh, short-term changes in government and government policy. It is also clear that the extent to which the developed nations supply educational opportunities and technical assistance to the developing countries will in large measure help shape their future destinies and perhaps their allegiances as well. To underestimate the importance of foreign students in their current numbers or to fail to devise national policies regarding them is not necessarily to ignore future friends and allies. Continuing friendship is

in no way guaranteed by foreign study. But it is to overlook a very significant influence both on today's educational systems and on what may often prove a subtle but nonetheless important element in tomorrow's international relationships.

Although the United States does not have as large a proportion of foreign students within its total student population as most of the other major receiving nations, it has by far the largest number of foreign students—roughly a third of all those currently studying abroad. Recent studies by the American Council on Education, the Institute for International Education, and the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs have all drawn attention to the importance of international students on the American educational scene and the absence of any national awareness, goals, or policies in regard to them. Because the subject of foreign student policy is very topical and because the United States has not yet clearly come to grips with either the actualities or implications of having almost 340,000 foreign students enrolled in its colleges and universities in 1983-84, it may be useful to look in detail at the experiences of some of the other major receiving nations and their successes and failures in evolving practical and sustainable policies for foreign students in such areas as admission and retention, costs and quality, priorities and emphases.

Nowhere is the impact of growing foreign student enrollment more keenly felt than in the three Western European countries I visited in Fall 1983 as a representative of the American Council on Education. In each of these countries—Britain, France, and Germany—the growth in numbers has been phenomenal. In Britain the number of overseas students more than doubled between 1966 and 1978. In France it sextupled between 1960 and 1982. In Germany foreign student enrollment increased only 55 percent from 1972 to 1981, but its impact was great on a relatively compact and crowded system.

Foreign students also make up a significant proportion of total student enrollments in each of the three countries. In Britain even after the implementation of full-cost fees, eight percent of the students in advanced higher and further education (14.4 percent at the university level) were of overseas origin. In France the over-all number is approximately 13 percent. In Germany it is five percent. One problem created for each of the countries by this high concentration of foreign students is that the gross numbers of foreign students are not divided equally by national origin, discipline, or level of study and are often unevenly dispersed within various geographic areas of the

receiving nation. In Britain, for example, 40 percent of all foreign students come from four countries: Malaysia, Iran, Hong Kong, and Nigeria. In Germany, 33 percent come from four countries: Greece, Turkey, Iran, and Indonesia. In France 55 percent come from Africa—33 percent from the countries of the Maghreb. These distributions do not necessarily parallel current diplomatic and foreign trade priorities, nor do they seem to reflect the needs of the least developed countries. In England and in Germany evidence exists that the numbers of students from least developed and low income countries has been going down, a tendency paralleled in the United States by our increasing proportion of wealthy foreign students and the decline in students from Africa and Latin America.

In shaping the patterns of foreign student enrollments, history would appear to be destiny. Britain and France both heavily enroll students from former colonies. In part these enrollments reflect historic ties; in part they reflect convenient, and again historically based, similarities in educational systems, which make it easier for students to transfer their studies abroad. Germany draws both from nations with whom she has historic ties and from those to whom Germany's central location in Europe, previous enthusiasm for foreign "guest workers," and strong scientific tradition all hold special appeal. Language is also an important determinant in shaping enrollment patterns and national policies. One reason for the popularity of British and American education is the dominance of English as a world language. Not only do foreign students tend to speak English before they enroll; they want to master English as the key to world science and world trade. Conversely, Germany and France both appear to seek foreign students, in part as an effort to maintain the importance of their linguistic status. France still hopes to retain French as a world language; Germany must have foreign nationals throughout the world who are fluent in her relatively unfamiliar tongue. Germany, too, has the burden of world-wide opprobrium to contend with after two world wars. Many of her receptive policies regarding foreign students and foreign assistance are acknowledged to be part of an attempt to regain world standing.

Particular policies adopted for foreign students also reflect the influence of broader immigration issues and attitudes toward ethnicity. The clash of cultures that can be engendered by the presence of large numbers of foreign students on a particular campus or in a particular area is seldom publicly admitted as a reason for restrictive

enrollment measures, nor is the fear of the foreign student as a potentially permanent resident and job competitor often discussed. But these arguments, even if unspoken, obviously do enter into the determination of foreign student policy. As foreign student numbers have spiralled, these factors have undoubtedly had an influence on the more restrictive approaches taken in recent years by the three nations under consideration here.

Wherever I went in Europe, the number distribution, quality, impact, and cost of an expanding foreign student population were topics of lively concern. The issue was probably most active in Britain, which was still experiencing the aftershock of the Thatcher government's decision to eliminate the so-called hidden subsidy to foreign students by making them pay full cost for their tuition. With total foreign student enrollments down by more than a third in less than five years and a number of foreign governments still nursing their outrage at the sudden change in policy, efforts were under way in Britain to preserve the principle of "no subsidy" for foreign students while, at the same time, assisting nations with which Great Britain had close ties to continue having access to her educational system. France, too, was experiencing a pendulum swing back to somewhat more liberal policies as the Mitterand government sought to modify some of the more restrictive regulations imposed by its predecessors without at the same time opening the floodgates to unregulated foreign student enrollment. In Germany, where the proportion of foreign students was considerably lower, the foreign student issue was to some degree subsumed under more general questions about the university system, but questions of access and quality were still widely debated.

Whatever the national variations, however, one fact was clear: each of the countries had altered its policies in the past few years to restrict and control the flow of foreign students. Britain had done this through the mechanism of tuition. Germany and France, with tuition essentially free, had sought to impose entrance qualifications that would screen out the academically weaker student and thus reduce numbers. Needing a rationale to justify its actions to the outside world, Britain had based its claim for limiting numbers on financial inability; Germany and France had sought the somewhat more philosophical concept of "equality," arguing that their systems could only absorb foreign students whose educational backgrounds were comparable to those of their own domestic students. Whatever the reasons, the effect of the new policies, even in their attenuated forms, has been to control

and regulate what had previously been an almost untrammeled flow of foreign students. The days of broad welcome and indiscriminate subsidy through low-cost or no-cost tuition are clearly over. In their place, all three governments appear to be developing remarkably similar schemes that focus on graduate, rather than undergraduate, students and on targeted schemes of exchange. These exchange schemes seem to be more focused on expanding East-West ties among the highly industrialized nations than on North-South ties between the industrialized and underdeveloped nations.

One of the arguments frequently given for concentrating on graduate students is that their study abroad does not drain needed undergraduate enrollments from developing universities in Third World countries and causes less of a "deacculturation" problem than occurs with younger students who may face longer stays. There is considerable validity in both these statements, but there are also some practical advantages in focusing on graduate students. One primary reason for favoring graduate students is that they are likely to congregate in the sciences and technology. If such knowledge represents potential power and wealth to the foreign student, acquiring the brightest students—of whatever national origin—is clearly of value to the receiving country, which can profit from their graduate research work and may retain them as scientists, or at least friendly colleagues and clients, in the future. Germany, with its long tradition of scientific and technical leadership, most plainly illustrates the value that modern industrialized nations place upon such expertise. Not only is Germany adopting policies that favor the graduate student, she is also expanding her number of institutes of advanced study in the hope of sharing in the worldwide growth of technical information. She appears at this time to be particularly interested in such relationships with the United States. Of all the countries, I visited, Germany also seemed to me to have the best understanding of technical assistance. Her educational programs for students from Third World countries stress not only basic scientific and technical study but also their applicability in a technologically underdeveloped context, often a key issue in assessing the effectiveness of foreign training.

Britain, France, and Germany are thus in a transition period. Government policies in the three countries are such that all foreign students who are rich enough or well-qualified enough (not surprisingly often the same) can gain entrance to one or another of these highly desired educational systems. Only in Great Britain has there thus far

been a perceptible drop in the total numbers of foreign students, but a molding and shaping has been going on in all three countries that is gradually shifting student enrollment patterns to conform more closely to governmental goals. If there has been some loss in access to educational opportunities and a weakening of the more welcoming policies that foreign students could once expect, there may also be slight qualitative gains in the conditions for these students. Both the British and the French are considering better counseling and guidance services and, in France, new preparatory programs for foreign students—services that to date only the Germans have offered. Although government policy seems ambiguous on the subject, there is also distinct evidence that many British universities are now actively recruiting foreign students, at least from the more prosperous nations.

Behind all these policies and practices lie a series of philosophical questions, which are unanswered and even unasked. The fundamental question is, of course: why enroll foreign students at all? This question was perhaps easier to answer in earlier days when the number of such students was relatively low and the individual student and his (usually his) cultural background made an impact on the campus. Paradoxically, that personal impact seems to diminish as numbers escalate. One reason is that foreign students tend to cluster in national groups, thus reducing potential interactions with the receiving environment. Another reason may be that foreign students in large numbers tend to be perceived as an undifferentiated mass—sometimes a slightly threatening mass—rather than as persons. Given the absence of a personal dimension and with a dying spirit of internationalism generally, the focus on foreign students is increasingly economic and pragmatic. Foreign students frequently complain about the treatment they receive while abroad, but they keep coming. Receiving countries justify their expenditures on foreign students primarily in economic terms. Foreign students help foreign trade or assist diplomacy, or are needed to form the cadre of foreign managers essential for transnational industries. In Germany, and to some degree in France, the tradition of educational cosmopolitanism—of a worldwide community of scholars—is still expressed by policy makers. But their statements appear to reflect nostalgia for a world that was, rather than a burning desire to shape the world that is or will be. As one talks to the policy makers, there is little evidence of a strong international thrust. Ironically, of all the countries I studied, only East Germany has any student policies stressing the intermingling of foreign and native-born

students, and there it occurs for the clearly ideological purpose of enhancing the spread of Marxism.

Because of this absence of a genuine internationalism—and because many of the older concepts regarding the foreign student are no longer applicable—there is currently no conceptual framework in which to explore the value of a foreign student presence apart from the pragmatic argument, which is valid but incomplete. The foreign student is no longer a grateful colonial subject returning to the home country, probably not a wandering scholar in search of pure knowledge, and not even necessarily the representative of an educationally disadvantaged nation. The motives on both sides are purely practical and, as a result, the altruistic arguments that could be used when numbers were relatively low and costs and impact were minimal can no longer be invoked without question. Governments thus seek a rationale for controlling the foreign student flow that will moderate the foreign student presence and bring it into greater accord with other aims without offending former friends and allies. It is a very delicate matter to speak of an appropriate proportion of foreign students or to set priorities for different national groups or areas of study. The countries I visited are understandably—given the British experience—treading very carefully in the area of policy delineation. But the danger in the current situation is that the some of the most fundamental reasons for encouraging a foreign student presence—educational enrichment and cultural interchange—tend to remain unspoken at the very time when we need them most.

We are lacking not only a well-enunciated rationale in regard to foreign students but also a data base. Enrollment statistics still vary from country to country because of different national definitions for foreign students. In Great Britain, in particular, delays in gathering data appear to have impacted policy counterproductively: the more hard-boiled full-cost policies might not have been implemented had there been evidence in time of a containment of foreign student enrollments. No good measure is yet available of the costs or comparative expenditures on foreign students in different countries. If one does look at foreign student enrollments pragmatically, the question of "true" cost is a critical one. To what extent does the foreign student represent a marginal expenditure? How does the cost of educating foreign students differ in rigidly tenured, as opposed to relatively non-tenured, national educational systems? What is the role of foreign students in relation to rising or falling home student

demographic profiles? If only by default, Britain is moving toward a better understanding of marginal costs of foreign students through her new flexible fee policy which will let the universities set the tuition costs for overseas students program by program. But well-reasoned national policies toward foreign students are dependent on precisely such cost-benefit analyses.

Cost-benefit analysis, to phrase it crudely, must also be applied to the criteria for selective assistance. As Martin Kenyon, the head of Britain's Overseas Students Trust, has phrased it, "the perceptions of benefit and obligation—political, cultural, commercial, education, and developmental"—are not well understood between sending and receiving nations. Nor, he adds, do we have a good understanding of "the educational/academic value of overseas students" and their contribution to the totality of the university system. We may say that foreign students add to the richness of academic life and sincerely believe that they do, but there is little in the way of data or policy, either in the United States or abroad, to substantiate such statements. A particularly vexing question, on which ignorance appears to be vast, is the relative academic performance of foreign students. Because of the visibility of their failures, their successes may well not be recognized. Much of the argumentation in Germany, for example, on behalf of limiting the enrollment of foreign students was based on their seemingly poor academic track record. But there is increasing documentation to show that the opposite may actually be true. Indeed, Peter Williams, Britain's leading academic analyst on foreign student issues, states that a thorough study of foreign student performance would frequently show such students to be among the very top graduates.

A forum in which to compare and refine data and in which to discuss and formulate policy on foreign students is clearly a high priority at this point. In June 1983, a useful international meeting on foreign student policy was held in Britain under the auspices of the Ditchley Foundation, and it is to be hoped that such conferences might be repeated at least triennially. The future direction of foreign student enrollments is unclear at this time. It is not certain whether the levelling off that the United States is experiencing represents a plateau or the beginning of either a new upward or a downward trend. Other national enrollments are similarly unclear. A world in which all interrelationships are growing more intricate must still answer many key questions of foreign student policy: whether foreign students are

to be actively recruited, and from where and in what way; by what criteria they are to be admitted, and to what degree they should be financially supported; what sort of educations they should receive, and how they should be counseled and advised; what their interactions should be with the universities themselves, and how the universities can best profit from their presence; to what extent they should be encouraged to stay or to return; and what their ultimate relationship will be with the foreign country that helped educate them. A vast potential for good in international educational ties exists, at the undergraduate, graduate, and postgraduate level, both as ends in themselves and as a potential force in the development of greater international understanding. That only 7,940 of the 338,894 foreign students enrolled in American higher education in 1983-84 were supported by our government is striking evidence that we do not recognize the importance of the international student even to our own self-interest. When we compare the investment we are making in the support of international education to that being made by the Germans or the French, the difference is startling. Many of the problems and solutions found by the three European countries studied here are not applicable to the United States, with its far more decentralized system of higher education, but both the mistakes and successes of these Western democracies are worth consideration as we attempt to formulate a more constructive approach to our educational relationships abroad.

I should like to express my appreciation to the Trustees of the State University who granted me a two-month study leave from my responsibilities as President of the College at New Paltz in which to conduct the research associated with the project. I must also state my deep gratitude to Cassandra Pyle, who, as Vice President for International Affairs of the American Council of Education, both financially supported my travels through a grant from the Ford Foundation and was a source of constant encouragement and inspiration. I am grateful to the British Council, which subsidized my stay in Great Britain, and to the Exxon Foundation, whose gift has made possible the publication of this study. My debts abroad are numerous. The acknowledgements at the end of the volume list almost all the individuals I met during my travels, although they cannot sufficiently express my appreciation for their helpfulness. I must, however, make special mention of Martin Kenyon, of the Overseas Students Trust; Peter Williams, of the Commonwealth Secretariat;

Karl Roeloffs and Manfred Stassen, of DAAD (*Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdient*); Geneviève Ramos Acker, of the Franco-American Commission for Educational Exchanges; and Bernard Poli, of the Ministère Nationale de l'Éducation. Their help in arranging my stays and in reviewing this manuscript has been extraordinary. Their personal kindness to me and their genuine concern for the foreign student and for foreign exchanges and assistance encourage me to believe that able and dedicated individuals are working to resolve some of the problems and issues that the monograph discusses.

ONE

Great Britain: The Overseas Student And Full-Cost Fees

Background

The British use of the phrase "overseas student" is a reminder that the foreign student in Great Britain has historically been a member of Empire rather than a foreigner or alien in her midst. The dissolution of Empire, the rise of new nations and new nationalisms, the worldwide origins of students seeking to pursue their education abroad, and the sheer weight of numbers have all eroded the concept of the international student as a British subject coming home. But the persistence of the phrase "overseas student" recalls the imperial origins of the foreign student presence in Great Britain and underscores the significance of some of the recent changes that have taken place. More dramatically than any other European country, Great Britain demonstrates the conflict between an earlier and simpler view of the foreign student and today's complexities and constraints.

Until the 1960s no offical distinction was made between overseas and home students, although massive immigration in the 1940s and 1950s was making Britain more conscious of a growing foreign presence. Ironically, one of the first references to the foreign student as a distinct entity, rather than an undifferentiated element within the general student population, occurred in the famous Robbins Committee Report of 1963, whose call for broadened access to higher education formed the basis for the tremendous expansion of tertiary institutions in the 1960s and 1970s. Although generally favorable to foreign students, the Robbins Report nevertheless itemized the cost of overseas student education as a separate factor for the first time. It may have thus helped pave the way for the introduction of a differential fee structure in 1967-68. Like the changed immigration policies introduced in Britain earlier in the decade, differential fees carried

with them the implicit assumption that large numbers of foreign students were in some ways a burden on the nation and that they should bear a higher fraction of their educational costs than domestic students did.

Data for the academic year 1966-67—the last year of undifferentiated fees for foreign and home students — show 35,719 overseas students enrolled in all publicly financed institutions of higher and further education and an additional 37,674 overseas students enrolled in the nonpublic sector (Inns of Court, nursing schools, private colleges, etc.) The nonpublic number has remained remarkably constant over time and, since it involves no use of public funds, has never really generated much concern. Foreign student enrollment in public institutions of higher learning has soared, however, since the 1960s, giving rise to considerable concern and public policy debate. The number of overseas students in universities and other institutions of advanced, higher, and further education went from a 1966-67 base of 24,539 to a peak of 59,625 in 1978-79. In nonadvanced further education (roughly the equivalent of adult and continuing education in the United States), the number went from 11,180 to 27,154 in the same period. The total overseas student enrollment for publicly financed higher and further education thus increased approximately 250 percent—from 35,719 to 86,779—in little more than a decade. The public perception of these rising numbers may well have been accentuated by the very heavy proportion of overseas students enrolled in certain universities and courses. It should be noted that in 1979-80, 40 percent of those students came from four main sending countries: Malaysia (17.2 percent), Iran (9.2 percent), Hong Kong (7.5 percent), and Nigeria (6.2 percent). The major subject areas in which overseas students were enrolled for university level and other advanced work were: engineering and technology (38.3 percent), science (17.0 percent), and social administration and business studies (29.1 percent).

The reasons for these skyrocketing numbers of overseas students are not difficult to explain. In part, they reflect a continuing worldwide trend, but they also represent a variety of uniquely British factors; historic ties with the Commonwealth countries and former colonies whose educational systems interface easily with the British system on which they have been modeled, the increasing role of English as a world language, the high quality of British universities, the relevance of the relatively new polytechnics to the needs of industrializing

countries, and an apparent perception of the high quality of British science and technology. Not least important are the brevity of the English undergraduate course compared to requirements in the United States and most European countries and the cheapness of the pound relative to other currencies in the early 1970s.

Perhaps because of the outcry from the universities that arose when differential fees were first introduced in 1967-68 or because of a temporary dip in the numbers of overseas students in the first few years following the tuition increase, no further increases in foreign student tuition were proposed for the next eight years. By 1975-76, however, the doubling of overseas student numbers over the 1966-67 base and the rising proportion of overseas students within the total student pool reintroduced the issue of overseas student costs. Starting with a modest increase to £320 for all students, overseas student tuition increased dramatically every year from 1975-76 to the end of the decade. By 1979-80, overseas tuition stood at £940 for undergraduates and £1230 for graduate students — or roughly four and five times what they had been when differential tuition was first introduced, although these figures must be interpreted in the light of inflation.

Stiffer fees, however, did not seem to deter enrollments and the number of overseas students continued to rise dramatically. By the peak year 1978-79, the number of foreign students was almost 40 percent higher than it had been in 1974-75, the year before the second round of increases began. By 1977, therefore, the Department of Education and Science began advocating a system of institutional self-regulation, or quotas, which would limit overseas student enrollments to the 1977-78 level and then begin rolling them back still further. It is not clear how extensively institutions responded to this recommendation, especially since the existing system, which allowed them to receive both a subsidy for overseas students as part of their base budget and to collect the increased fees as additional revenue, gave them no incentive to do so. Professor Peter Williams records with regret the discontinuation of one highly successful program at the University of London which catered exclusively to foreign students and suggests that such voluntary limitation, combined with the impact of higher and higher fees, was responsible for the slight downturn in numbers that began in 1979-80. These most recent data were probably not yet available when the Thatcher government announced its full-cost decision in 1979 — a decision that Williams believes was probably made on the assumption of ever-rising numbers and of inaction on the part of the vice-chancellors.

The introduction of full-cost fees for overseas students in 1980 was at once a great surprise and no surprise at all. On the one hand, the whole tenor of action since 1966 had been toward the recouping of a greater and greater fraction of the subsidy for overseas students (although, paradoxically, in a way that enriched the individual universities rather than the British government) and toward the development of strategies of containment. Moreover, there had been rumors, as soon as the conservative government had been elected in the spring of 1979, that such a policy would be put into effect. On the other hand, it is universally affirmed that no consultation took place either with the Foreign and Commonwealth Office or with the universities themselves regarding the new fee structure. In terms of public reaction, the full-cost policy burst forth full-blown.

The rationale offered by the Thatcher government for the new fee policy included the financial austerity of the UK and the relative wealth of many of the students taking advantage of her system. Arguing, among other considerations, that 20 percent of the foreign students in British institutions came from countries with a higher per capita income than Great Britain, the government established fees that represented, at a minimum, a doubling of the already increased fees for overseas students. Arts and social science courses at the universities were to cost £2000, science and applied science £3000, and medicine and agriculture £5000. These increases were only a first step, however. By 1983-84, while home students were paying only £480 per annum, overseas students were being charged between £2900 and £7000, depending on the course. The new differential tuition rate for the overseas student thus ranged from six to fifteen times the home fee.

The Thatcher program did contain certain modifying conditions: EEC and refugee students were given home student status and a new scheme of special awards for overseas research students was introduced. But the definitions of the home student were made more stringent. Greece, for example, was denied EEC status although she was shortly to join the Community, and the number of overseas residents able to gain home student status was sharply curtailed by a new series of regulations and court rulings.

The outcry over the new policy, both at home and abroad, was ferocious. Student groups were angered and the universities complained both on principle and out of the shock of a double blow (withdrawal of the subsidy for overseas students from the base budget, compounded by the loss of tuition revenues as numbers dropped).

According to one study, income from overseas students under the new dispensation was probably half of what it would have been under the previous circumstances. Business and industry also joined in the protest, arguing the potential and, in some cases, actual loss of trade as foreign governments threatened to reduce imports. The most vigorous protests were launched by the Malaysian and Nigerian governments, both highly dependent on the British educational system for their tertiary instruction. Hong Kong, Cyprus, and other nations joined in the clamor. Some sense of the intensity of the outcry may be gathered even today from the rueful comments of Foreign and Commonwealth Office ministers and officials who were forced to bear the brunt of the objections in their travels abroad or in their meetings at home. According to one Foreign Secretary, Great Britain is still facing the repercussions of her initial decision, with attitudes in a number of nations only partly mollified by subsequent concessions. A more temperate but effective response is to be found in the establishment of a Standing Committee on Student Mobility by the Commonwealth Secretariat. Acknowledging the considerable pressures on the British government to limit overseas student access and subsidy, the Standing Committee nevertheless described the full-cost policy as a decision taken from "within a domestic framework, which consciously subordinate[d] external to domestic interests, the future to the present."

The most dramatic result of the full-cost policy was the drop in student numbers. Although there are some discrepancies in the figures cited below because of changes in definition over time and some small differences in statistics compiled by the British Council and the Department of Education and Science, the plummeting numbers may be summarized as follows:

Total Enrollments for Higher Education:

Advanced and Non-Advanced

1978-79 (peak) 85,000
1983-84 (est.) 52,500
Difference. . . .-38%

Higher Education

1978-79 (peak) 59,625
1983-84 (est.) 44,800
Difference. . . .-25%

Non-Advanced

1979-80 (avg.) 27,000
1983-84 (est.) 7,800
Difference. . . .-71%

The imposition of full-cost fees seems also to have accentuated two other trends. Although the percentage of overseas students enrolled in advanced higher and further education fell from 11 percent of total enrollment in 1977-78 to eight percent in 1982-83, the tendency of foreign students to enroll in advanced rather than non-advanced courses was marked, and there appears to have been a slight rise over the period 1980-81 to 1982-83 in applications for post-graduate courses. More significantly, the imposition of full-cost fees further accelerated the downward trend of enrollments of students from the less developed countries that had been apparent in the UK since 1974-75, or since the beginning of the period of fee increases. Between 1974-75 and 1980-81 enrollments of students from the least developed countries dropped by 12 percent and from low-income countries by 42 percent. The trend seems to have been moderated for students from the least developed countries for the period 1979-80 through 1980-81, probably by various British scholarship schemes; but enrollments from low income countries continued to show a steep decline.

The new policy is said to have saved £150 million a year in government educational costs, although this is a somewhat debatable figure since some new expenditures were incurred. But many observers see a much more complex cost-benefit computation in which Britain has unquestionably paid a high price. The Overseas Students Trust sums up the losses in its highly effective 1982 study, *A Policy for Overseas Students:*

Against this [saving of £150 million] must be weighed a certain amount of direct damage to British interests, the alienation of many of Britain's closest friends abroad, the throwing of the finances of British higher and further education into some disarray, and the forgoing of benefits to Britain, some of them long-term and intangible. Some of the short term effects can be measured: such as the loss of 25 percent of the students in UK higher and further education in the two years since the policy was introduced; the diversion of students from Britain to other countries, some of them friendly to the UK but others not; the loss of exports directly attributable to the full-cost fees decision; the loss of income to UK education institutions; the number of representations made by overseas Heads of State to our own Prime Minister, and through diplomatic channels at all levels. But other effects are more diffuse and less readily calculable. They are nonetheless real for all that.

The Overseas Students Trust and the "Pym Package"

One of the most extraordinary elements in the story of British policy toward overseas students is the role played by a small organization, the Overseas Students Trust, both in documenting the damage done by the full-cost policy and developing at least partially mitigating solutions to the problem. The Trust was established in 1961 as an educational charity by a group of leading transnational companies. Its mission was to promote the education of overseas students in Britain and to help foster appropriate conditions for their studies. Martin Kenyon, current Director of the Trust, warmly acknowledges the influence of NAFSA for the work of the OST in recent years. Even before the 1980 crisis, the Trust had already commissioned two major studies on overseas students. The earlier report, *Freedom to Study* (1978) is a survey of the requirements and attitudes of overseas students. The report is remarkably candid in documenting the frequent dissatisfactions that overseas students, especially nonwhite students, expressed with their experiences in Britain. It also discussed the kinds of support services needed for foreign students. A later volume, *The Overseas Student Question: Studies for a Policy*, edited by Professor Peter Williams, was begun in 1979 as a result of year-long discussions among business leaders and others regarding overseas student policy. Its chapters included a history of the overseas student problem in Britain, a cost-benefit analysis of the overseas student presence, studies of the foreign policy and foreign trade implications of educating students from abroad, and an assessment of the needs of developing

countries for overseas training, as well as an international review of enrollment statistics.

Although the Overseas Students Trust was well placed by virtue of its leadership, its knowledgeability, and its excellent previous track record to cope with the overseas student policy crisis, both its speed and its persuasiveness are remarkable to the outside observer. Following very shortly upon the actual implementation of the new policy in October 1980, the Trust rapidly began an analysis of the problem and a study of options that would lead directly to a set of policy proposals. Meetings with the Minister of State from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, which took a particular interest in having the policy reversed in some way, assured governmental interest in the OST study from the start. Indeed, the government appears to have viewed the OST analysis and recommendations as providing a reasonably graceful means of egress from the uncomfortable corner into which it had painted itself. Peter Williams, who had edited the previous *Overseas Student Question*, headed the new OST project.

Despite the strong commitment held by the leadership of the Overseas Students Trust to foreign students, it was determined from the start to oppose any return to the former policy of indiscriminate subsidy. Instead the Trust tried to honor the government's need to contain costs and to stem the unregulated proliferation of overseas students. It strove to find a reasoned middle ground that would preserve a strong international presence on British campuses, enable the country to meet its obligation to foreign nations that were dependent on it for their educational needs, and strengthen British overseas influences. In a paper published in the *Comparative Education Review*, Peter Williams attributes the Trust's success in having "won the confidence of Whitehall" to the "reasonableness of its approach in contrast to what Government regarded as unduly shrill and uninformed comment coming from elsewhere." Although he modestly attributes the Government's ultimate change in policy to the weight of overseas pressure, a remarkable proportion of the Trust's proposals were adopted by the Government, and those which were not accepted were given the dignity of a detailed rebuttal in a paper prepared by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office dated February 1983.

The Government's response to the recommendations of the Overseas Students Trust can be traced in a series of Parliamentary statements extending over an almost two-year period: (1) On May 19,

1981, the Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office announced in the House of Commons that the Government was prepared to cooperate with the OST in drawing up options for policy toward overseas students; (2) on June 6, 1982, the Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary announced and welcomed the publication of OST's report *A Policy for Overseas Students;* and (3) On February 8, 1983, The Foreign and Commonwealth Secretary unveiled the Government's revised policy statement.

The "Pym Package," as it is popularly called, after the then Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, the Rt. Hon. Francis Pym, rests on a series of fundamental policy conditions, first stated by the Government in June, 1982:

- (1) that the Government recognizes the educational, economic, and foreign policy reasons for encouraging overseas students to come to the United Kingdom;
- (2) that "there can be no return to the previous policy of indiscriminate and open ended subsidy," but that support schemes should be devised to support targeted groups of students;
- (3) that quotas are undesirable;
- (4) that current allocations for student support schemes should be reexamined;
- (5) that attention should be paid to cooperative ventures with foreign and Commonwealth governments and private industry; and
- (6) that consideration should be given to allowing institutions "greater flexibility to set their fees levels" and to defining home and overseas students.

In line with these underlying precepts, the Pym package stuck to the principle of full-cost payment, but modified it in significant ways in order to accomodate foreign policy needs and other criteria. Specifically, the Government announced its intention to increase its support for overseas students, costing at that point at about £65 million a year, by £46 million over the next three years. This £46 million involved the allocation of an additional £25 million of "new" money to the Diplomatic Wing of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the reallocation of £21 million from the unallocated reserve of the FCO to the bilateral technical cooperation program. These moneys would enable the Government to accomplish a number of goals, including:

- The establishment of home fees for undergraduate students from Hong Kong and selected students from Malaysia and a subsidy for

all undergraduate students from Cyprus. In view of the relative affluence of Hong Kong, that program would be established on a cost-sharing basis and students would be subject to a means test;

- The expansion and strengthening of the existing Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan;
- Increased funding for the Diplomatic Wing of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to enable it to bring to the UK "present and future leaders, decision-makers and formers of opinion;"
- Expansion of the current bilateral Technical Cooperation Programme of the Overseas Development Administration;
- Continuation of the Overseas Research Students Awards Scheme;
- £100,000 a year to the British Council for the period 1983-86 to conduct marketing surveys and to promote the UK educational system as a whole in foreign countries.

Along with these fund allocations, consideration was given to allowing universities to institute a flexible fee policy for overseas students (provided the principle of no subsidy was observed and that there was no diversion of resources for home students) and encouragement of reciprocal concessionary fee status agreements with institutions overseas.

An Interdepartmental Group (IDG) of officials within the government had earlier been established under the joint chairing of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office and the Department of Education and Science to coordinate the activities of the various governmental agencies involved with overseas students and to respond to the OST proposals. Following the Pym measures, the IDG was charged with maintaining liaison with appropriate groups and organizations outside the governmental structure. For this purpose a Round Table was instituted.

The first meeting of the Round Table in November 1983 was chaired by a Foreign and Commonwealth Minister, with membership drawn from government departments and nongovernmental organizations, representing industry, education, and overseas students. Generally deemed to be successful, the meeting led to the creation of a series of "working parties." One of them, the working party on Crisis and Hardship Arrangements for Overseas Students, has been aptly dubbed CHAOS. Other working parties are addressing what are clearly some of the key foreign student questions for Britain and for other nations: enrollment facts and trends; criteria for selective assistance; perceptions of benefit and obligation; the educational and

academic benefit of overseas students and their contribution to research in British universities; problems of access and cost, particularly marginal costs; the support services needed by overseas students; and the development of reciprocal schemes of exchange.

Development Assistance

One question that must obviously be asked in regard to any set of policies for foreign students is the extent to which it serves the needs of developing countries. British policy in this regard is set forth in position statements first issued in 1980 and elaborated in 1981:

> The Government will continue to provide aid to the developing countries on a substantial scale. Official aid continues to be an essential element in development especially for the poorest countries. . . . [and we will] continue to give priority to the poorest countries in allocating bilateral aid.

An important modification of policy, however, is the caveat that:

> It is right at the present time to give greater weight in the allocation of our aid to political, industrial and commercial considerations alongside our basic developmental objective.

Related policy statements also stress the importance of ties to the Commonwealth.

It is not clear, however, to what extent the government is implementing these policies. The £25 million package of special subsidies for Hong Kong and the dependencies, Malaysia, and Cyprus designed to serve certain diplomatic and commercial interests is certainly not meant to address the problem of the declining enrollments of students from the poorest countries, and it is not possible at this time to know in detail how the £21 million in reallocated funds provided to the Overseas Development Administration under the Pym package will be used, since the latest financial data made available were for 1980. However, a number of programs conducted by ODA do seem to have the promise of being targeted toward the neediest countries.

Activities undertaken in the past by ODA and presumably continuing in an expanded form under the new dispensation include capital aid, such as building the Kenya Polytechnic in Nairobi or science buildings at the universities of Botswana and Lesotho. They also cover a wide range of technical cooperation programs, including salary supplementation for British education staff overseas; training programs and other projects designed to improve the quality of teaching and teachers in developing countries; other training awards either for

study *in situ*, in a third country, or in the UK; various schemes to assist in library development and book acquisition; assistance in English language instruction; and support for such organizations as the British Council, whose own activities—although not necessarily focussed on less-developed countries—included the following in 1982-83:

- 2,522 short professional visits overseas by British specialists;
- 18,768 youth exchanges to and from Britain;
- 863 education contact staff working abroad;
- 20,898 visitors, students, and trainees for whom the Council arranged programs in Britain; and
- an average of 52,449 students studying English at British Council Centers at any one time.

How far these and other programs achieve the British Government's announced goal of assisting the least-developed countries, I am not competent to judge. The number of overseas students and trainees covered by the various awards schemes in 1981 totalled 11,671. Professor Williams comments in *A Policy for Overseas Students* on the particular importance of such awards schemes to students from the poorest countries. Citing data which shows, for example, that 90 percent of Zimbabwean students and 100 percent of students from Bangladesh in the UK have some form of British government assistance, Williams concludes that "It can be observed how much more important are awards in relation to total students in Britain for the lowest income countries than for the highest. This is not at all surprising where access is determined by the ability to pay high fees." Corroborating William's analysis is still further data showing that a high percentage of students from least-developed and low-income countries appear to refuse awards because, even with partial assistance, sufficient funds are still not available to cover educational costs.

Future Trends and Policies

The loss of overseas student enrollments would seem particularly significant to Britain at this time because of the demographic situation. Like the United States, Britain is facing the prospect of declining student enrollments. Although it is sometimes said that foreign students compete with British students for limited university placements, no evidence exists to support this view. The new budgetary regulations for the universities put forth by the University Grants Committee do set a maximum number of enrollees for the university sector, with penalties for failing to meet or for exceeding those limits. The result

has been, for the time being, a flow of students into the overcrowded polytechnics, where the loss of foreign student numbers may well be compensated for by the rise in home students. (In fact, after a period of sluggish increase, British higher education enrollments were at their highest point ever in 1982-83.) But these conditions of pressure are probably only temporary. With the number of "qualified leavers" due to drop 23 percent between 1984 and 1994, the chances are that many places in British higher education will remain vacant unless non-traditional populations are found to replace the missing secondary school graduates.

British educational policy does not, however, seem to be moving in the direction of extending higher educational opportunity to new populations but rather toward continued contraction of the system. During my stay in Britain, new directives were being sent to the vice-chancellors and directors of polytechnics urging them to develop new models for shrinkage, which might include the closing or combining of existing institutions. In spite of these orders, none of the vice-chancellors with whom I spoke indicated any intention of using the overseas student as a "filler," claiming that their own commitment to quality, strengthened by peer pressure, would preclude any mere "headhunting."

Such protestations notwithstanding, the past few years have certainly seen increased British recruitment of overseas students. At full, rather than marginal, cost such students are a source of financial profit to the university and provide badly needed add-on revenues in the current period of austerity. Even if flexible fees are introduced, universities will still be able to price their courses for overseas students above their calculated marginal costs. The British Council is also increasing its activities, using the £100,000 a year allocated under the Pym package, and has already completed two of its projected eighteen marketing surveys. Its studies of higher educational needs and resources in Singapore and Jordan both point out the extent to which traditional-age undergraduate and graduate students, as well as workers and professionals in need of special training, may be amenable to British educational overtures. Although John Weston, head of overseas student marketing for the British Council, reports mixed institutional reaction to his activities, Peter Williams vividly describes current recruitment practices. "In inverse proportion to the drop in student enquiries at British Council offices through the capital cities of Asia and Africa," he writes, "are the rise in calls by vice-chancellors,

registrars, and professors seeking student business." While private entrepreneurial firms are used as part of the student search process, "British academics are. . .likely to be found these days visiting Kuala Lumpur or Lagos, discussing development plans, seeking out Government personnel officers responsible for staff training and enquiring about the training components of international assistance loans." Professor Williams also notes the proliferation of course prospectuses and brochures and advertisements in foreign newspapers. In keeping with the Pym proposals, considerable interest is being shown in evenly-funded exchanges with countries such as the United States and Canada. There is no evidence that this more aggressive recruitment posture has led to any lowering of admissions standards, but it is apparent that more informed attention and perhaps greater flexibility is being shown in regard to the evaluation of foreign credentials.

Another byproduct of the current market in which the overseas student, with a few exceptions, is no longer a subsidized guest of the state but a paying customer is a general change in attitude. Professor Williams also notes a trend toward the restructuring of courses to make them more relevant to the needs of overseas students, and efforts apparently have been made to shorten the length of study or to allow more of it to take place in the students' home country in order to cut study costs.

The fact that the overseas student is now by-and-large a paying proposition seems also to be leading to a greater recognition of his or her special needs. However critical we in America may be of the inadequacy of our foreign student support services, they are looked to as models in Great Britain and other European countries. During my stay in England, I was introduced to one person who was something of a rarity, a foreign student counselor, but such appointments are still a novelty. UKCOSA, the United Kingdom Council for Overseas Student Affairs, is modeled after our own NAFSA. It describes itself, in the current complex situation, as moving from "strength to strength" because of the ways in which it is being called upon to serve. This small group of relatively young people is being invited more and more frequently to provide training sessions on foreign student advising, to give counsel on particular foreign student crises usually involving some breakdown in the financing mechanism for groups of foreign nationals, and to make recommendation on foreign student policy, particularly in the area of regulations affecting immigration and fee

status. It is interesting that, as in other countries, UKCOSA notes the absence of data on women and the comparative disadvantages faced by female students and spouses.

Some Underlying Issues

Britain at this point seems to focus most attention on the short-term working out of the Pym proposals. During the time I was there, all the organizations interested in the overseas student—the OST, UKCOSA, representative vice chancellors and directors of polytechnics, Commonwealth associations, and church groups—were all deeply concerned over the first meeting of the Round Table: how it would coordinate and clarify policy, what it would do in reviewing and analyzing statistics, and how it might contribute to improved services for foreign students. For the outside observer, however, the British experience highlights a number of more fundamental policy questions: who speaks for the foreign student, what justifications exist for a foreign student presence, what are the costs and benefits of that presence, and where does the enlightened self-interest of government lie in regard to the whole question of international education and exchanges?

Certainly, the whole British experience raises the question of who speaks for the foreign student. Despite the increasingly negative foreign student policies that existed before the Thatcher Government moved to impose full-cost fees, there was no coordinated resistance in the UK either to rising fees or suggested voluntary quotas, although many university administrators and students—both "home" and "overseas"—did object to them, as did some external groups with a special concern for the overseas student. A number of commentators have, indeed, told me that it was the perceived absence of a "lobby" for the overseas students which persuaded the Department of Education and Science that, faced with the need to make massive cuts in the higher education budget, it could do so with relative impunity in the overseas student area.

Once a crisis occurred, however, a very wide range of support for a strong overseas presence appeared suddenly. Adherents of this broad movement included foreign governments previously dependent on Great Britain for educational services, various Commonwealth organizations, and British transnational industries and companies. The work of the OST in preparing its highly influential reports was funded by a broad spectrum of British businesses and clearly derived

much of its effectiveness from the political clout of its industrial backers. Very strong pragmatic arguments for continuing to educate the overseas students emerged from a survey conducted by the OST of forty-two transnational companies. The survey showed that previous overseas education experience helped create a valuable pool of locally employed personnel who understood British management methods and were sympathetic toward British trade. The emphasis on these economic arguments alienated some foreign students in Great Britain who objected to being viewed as objects of British economic policy rather than culturally and intellectually valued individuals. In the current British climate, however, the OST decision to make its arguments on purely pragmatic grounds, despite its own far broader philosophical convictions, was no doubt realistic. It is interesting to note in this regard that the Government specifically rejected the recommendation of the Overseas Students Trust that 10 percent of British awards for overseas students be made available to the colleges and universities as "*general scholarship support* not tied to any specific purposes but available to assist meritorious individuals of whatever kind to come to Britain to study."

The whole question of scholarships and subsidies vs. full-cost fees for foreign students poses other interesting questions concerning the worldwide educational obligations of industrialized nations. To what extent are highly industrialized countries, with fully developed educational systems, morally obligated or simply politically and economically well-advised to subsidize the education of foreign students? Should such partial subsidy extend to students from wealthier countries or from wealthier backgrounds? Or, especially in periods of economic difficulty for the receiving countries, should such support be strictly limited to students from the less developed nations, to nations with historic limitations on their educational systems, or to countries with which the host country has close ties? The increases in overseas student fees during the 1970s show an effort to make all foreign students bear a fuller share of their expenses. The division of the £46 million "Pym package" into almost equal parts—£25 million to the Foreign and Commonwealth Office for a limited number of countries with special connections to Great Britain and £21 million to ODA for further educational assistance to the developing world—shows perhaps how Britain is attempting to bring balance into a system which had previously placed great emphasis on technical cooperation awards.

In judging its educational best interests in regard to the overseas student, Great Britain appears to be shifting support away from the undergraduate and toward the more advanced foreign student. Although the Government's position paper states that awards should be available at all levels of higher and further education, there is a presumption in the Government's documents and in the statements of many spokespersons on the overseas student issue in favor of the postgraduate as opposed to the undergraduate or non-advanced student. (The special provisions for Hong Kong and Cyprus are, of course, an exception to this rule, based on those governments' requests). In part, this may be a realistic recognition that in the UK as in the USA, many postgraduate programs would collapse without foreign students. But informed opinion in Britain, as elsewhere on the Continent, seems to favor postgraduate students on the grounds that developing nations should be encouraged to build up their own undergraduate programs and that the extended absence of overseas students for the long period of time involved in undergraduate and postgraduate studies may "deculturize" them and make their future return difficult. Graduate students are also, of course, valuable because of the research they perform.

To what extent hidden issues of immigration are also contained in this preference for shorter-term students is impossible to assess in Great Britain. Overtly, at least, the British experience does not raise the immigration problems that loom larger in countries such as Germany. Although one Foreign Office Minister thought that the permeability of British immigration regulations did lead foreign students to stay in England—and did upset some of his constituents—most spokespersons did not think this was a significant problem at this time. Lacking a large "guest worker" population, Great Britain is also spared such questions of definition as the status of the child of a foreign worker's family which has resided abroad for more than a generation, and who now wishes to enter college.

The UK experience does very pointedly raise, however, the question of whether foreign students are "marginal" or not to the operational costs of the university. In making its calculations to impose full-cost fees, the DES simply did an admittedly "quick and dirty" computation, using gross enrollment numbers and expenditures. No account was taken of fixed costs or of the income generated by the foreign student either through fees and other expenditure or, in the case of graduate students, of the value of their labor and research. As

has been previously pointed out, the loss of revenues to UK educational institutions and possibly to the UK as a whole because of the Thatcher policies has been high. The new flexible fee approach suggested in the Pym package, which allows each institution to fix an appropriate "no subsidy" fee for each of its programs, seems a realistic solution to the problem of marginal costs, although it in turn poses problems of equity to students and of competition among institutions.

A paradox in the current British system is that the number of foreign students (exclusive of EEC students) is limited only by ability to pay, while the numbers of home students is strictly limited by University Grants Committee fiat. This anomaly is apparently beginning to cause some minor friction, especially in fields such as medicine where places are limited. But a far more serious question for the UK, which resembles America in this regard, would appear to be in the future excess capacity of her universities and the extent to which the overseas student may be usefully served and usefully serve in preventing a counterproductive shrinkage of the system.

There is some evidence that both the government and individual vice chancellors are increasingly emphasizing institution to institution links—especially between British colleges and universities and those in highly developed nations such as the United States and Canada. These linkages do have the advantages of cost-effectiveness and careful targeting. They also point toward an emphasis on East-West rather than North-South relationships that seems also to mark some French and German thinking at this time.

TWO

France: The Evolution of Policy

Background

France is, after the United States, the world's largest receiver of foreign students. The total number of foreign students enrolled in higher education in France in 1981-82 was 114,000, or 12.8 percent of the total student population. This number represents an almost 600 percent increase over the 19,605 figure reported for 1960. More than half of the foreign students are of African origin, a third originating in the countries of the Maghreb. France's historic colonial ties, traditional cosmopolitanism, belief in the civilizing influence of French culture, and concern over the survival of French as a world language are all reflected in the openness of the French higher educational system to foreigners. These large numbers also provide some of the reasons for changes in French foreign student policy over the past decade.

Until 1974, when a procedure of *preinscription* was put into place, there were no restrictions on the enrollment of foreign students, although the number of students had already climbed to 66,500, representing 8.9 percent of the French student population. Under preinscription regulations, a foreign student wishing to enter a French university was required in the March preceding the desired year of entry to fill out a form at the French embassy in his or her country, indicating the educational program desired and a list of two or three universities selected in order of preference. Because of overcrowding in a Paris, non-Parisian university had to be included in that list. This dossier was then forwarded to the desired universities, which ultimately decided on the admissibility of the candidate.

As in Great Britain, these moderate measures neither contained nor directed foreign student flow. By 1979-80 the number of foreign students had risen to 112,200, or 13.2 percent of the total student population, with by far the largest numbers still enrolled in Parisian universities. Unable to use price as a mechanism, since French higher education is essentially free, the French government attempted to impose more stringent regulation through a tightening of the

preinscription requirements. The law of December 31, 1979, the so-called Imbert Decree, created a National Selection Commission whose role was to centralize the review of preinscription documents and to rule on the student's admissibility and choice of university. Although the universities retained the final disposition over the admission of foreign students, a general examination in the French language was demanded and students had to prove that their level of studies would have qualified them to enroll in a higher educational institution in their home country.

Although the Imbert Decree is said not to have stimulated the wave of student and political protests that might have been expected, but rather sporadic outbursts concerning one or more specific students faced with expulsion, there were nonetheless some violent demonstrations. At the University of Paris VII (Jussieu), for example, administrators report that Molotov cocktails were hurled from the rooftops and that one passerby was killed during the disturbance. Like the full-cost policies implemented in Great Britain, the Imbert regulations introduced considerable friction into French relationships with many foreign nations.

Most of these unpopular procedures were short-lived, however. By late 1981 the new Mitterand government had revoked some of the most visible elements of the Imbert Decree: the National Commission and the standardized language test. The stated aim of the new policies was not to limit the number of foreign students, but to inform and orient them better and to register them for courses which they could attend with reasonable chances of success. According to M. Bernard Poli of the Ministry of Education, France is concerned over "the consequences of an open door policy—the great number of failures which, then, reflects on [her] image abroad." He adds that France is "now trying to set up a whole system of tests and orientation mechanisms to make sure that the students understand enough French and will not suffer from a serious scientific gap between their real academic level and their proposed field of study." Difficulty with the French language is said to be increasing, even in previously French-dominated areas, because of the development of national languages in the home schools that accentuates the linguistic and cultural divergencies between foreign and French students.

To attain these new goals certain elements of the preinscription process have been retained, although in a modified form. Preinscription is still required for all students enrolling in the first

cycle, and students must have a special reason for choosing Paris over universities elsewhere in the country. Proofs of mastery of the French language and of admissibility to higher education in their country of origin continue to be required of students, and universities are asked to judge students on the basis of the comparability of their credentials to those of French students and on their ability to perform the requisite academic work. By definition, this includes the ability to handle academic work in the French language. Although the idea of a centralized examination has been dropped, a "national" test is now being organized in cultural centers abroad. As opposed to the TOEFL examination, the new test is not graded by a central office with uniform standards but left to the admitting university to judge in accordance with its standards. As a safety valve, if no university accepts a foreign student whose record is above average, the Ministry of Education will attempt to place the student in another institution of higher education.

How these new policies and procedures will all be put in place is still evolving. Figures are not yet available to show any diminution of the absolute number of foreign students, although the data for 1980-81 and 1981-82 show a slight decline in the percentage of foreign students as overall French enrollments continue to rise. Some observers believe that there will be an increase again in the proportion of foreign students in the French educational system, although not evenly distributed among institutions, levels, or disciplines. French demographic trends project no decline in the student population until the 1990s.

Enrollment Trends and Tendencies

A closer examination of current educational statistics by country of origin, level of study, academic discipline, and geographic distribution within France reveals several interesting aspects of the foreign student presence in France.

By far the largest percentage of foreign students in France is from Africa, mainly from francophone counties. At present there are more than 60,000 students of African background in France, representing 55 percent of total foreign student enrollment or about seven percent of the total enrollment in French higher educational institutions. Both absolute and relative numbers have increased dramatically over the years. In 1964-65, for example, there were little more than 9,000 African students in France, comprising only 34.5 percent of the French foreign student population. The rise in the proportion of African

students has taken place alongside a sharp decrease in the percentage of European students and some diminution in the percentage of American and Asian students as well. With students from the countries of the Maghreb comprising roughly a third of the total French foreign student population, an agreement is said to have been reached with the Moroccan government to limit the number of student visas it will offer. The effects of this limitation have yet to be seen.

Some caution must be observed, however, in interpreting the data on foreign students in France. Owing to French citizenship regulations, many "foreign" students in France are long-term residents of the country or were actually born there. Of the 108,471 foreign students in French higher education in 1978-79, 24,797 (or 23 percent) were the children of long-term residents such as foreign workers or of parents born in French colonies. This proportion appears to have been constant within a percentage point or two for the latter part of the 1970s. If one considers only "true foreign students," the growth of the foreign student population during the 1960s and 1970s is still dramatic but no more so than the striking increase in French higher education generally. The index of growth for French students between 1960 and 1978 is 401; the index for "true foreign students" 427.

Foreign student enrollment in the third cycle has increased over the years. In 1981-82 only 12.5 percent of all French students enrolled in higher education were in the third cycle, but 30.7 percent of all foreign students were so enrolled. For French students this represents a decrease from 17.1 percent in 1976-77; for foreign students an increase from 21.6% in 1976-77.

Reasons for the increasing proportions of foreign students in advanced level courses may include: French scholarship policy, which encourages such students; the absence of preinscription procedures for the third cycle; and perhaps a tendency toward extended studies by foreign students. This drift toward greater numbers of advanced students would seem to parallel a similar tendency already noted for Great Britain, where more restrictive entrance policies have had disproportionate effects on undergraduate and non-advanced students. During the period when the Imbert Decree was in effect, first cycle admissions declined by 15 percent. The continuation of Imbert measures for the first cycle and the more stringest admissions requirements mandated by the Mitterand government will presumably further this trend.

The 1981-82 data on disciplines chosen by foreign students reveals the continuing popularity of letters (36.2 percent). Science follows with 22.1 percent and economics and law come next with roughly 12 percent each. Foreign student enrollment in the *grandes écoles* is comparable to that in the university sector, but concentrated in literature and the fine arts. Enrollment in the *instituts universitaires de technologie* was low (2.5%) and enrollment in the *école d'ingénieurs* was minimal. Students wishing to study engineering and technology thus do not appear to be choosing France. It should also be noted that there are estimated to be between 50,000 and 70,000 students in France, in private institutions, such as business and secretarial schools. This could be as much as double the number enrolled in Great Britain.

It must finally be observed that, as in other countries, distribution by university and by location is uneven. Paris and its environs are still by far the largest recipients of foreign students. At the University of Paris VIII (St. Denis, formerly Vincennes) foreign student enrollment was 29 percent in 1981-82.

The Premises of Policy

Behind the recent shifts in French foreign student policy from the restrictiveness proposed by the Imbert Decree back to the greater openness and decentralization of the regulations promulgated by the Mitterand government lie a number of stated and unstated issues. In all three countries I visited, the seemingly unchecked rise in foreign student numbers apparently provoked at much the same time some desire to control the overall number of foreign students and, in some cases, their dispersion by discipline, level, and geographic area. Issues of cost, foreign student preparation, displacement of domestic students, and possible harm to the educational systems of the major sending nations were the most frequently expressed reasons for policy change, with Germany adding to those reasons the need to restrict foreign student entry into overcrowded professional areas such as medicine and law. To the extent that foreign students and foreign educational exchanges are valued as potential influences on foreign trade and diplomacy, one is likely to see the increasing development of targeted schemes for maintaining or expanding relationships with specific countries or regions rather than the advancement of more general enrollment schemes. But an overall negativism in the general population toward the growing numbers of foreign immigrants and foreign students, coupled with difficult economic conditions in

Europe, has unquestionably had an adverse effect on receptivity to foreign students as a whole. How the various governments have coped with the tension between the desire for strong foreign ties on the one hand and a rising concern over "foreigners" on the other has varied with the educational systems of each country and with the particular sensitivities they must address. The language of policy is thus interesting to examine.

According to a study done for the European Institute of Education and Social Policy, the arguments publicly cited by the French government as explanations for the Imbert Decree were:

- that France could no longer serve as an asylum for students rejected by other countries that had already taken measures to restrict foreign student entrance;
- that too-liberal entrance policies damaged the general caliber of students accepted into French universities and weakened the quality of French degrees;
- that there were also dangers to developing countries in a too-liberal French admissions policy, since the drain of students from institutions of higher education in former French colonies risked their ability to achieve a critical mass of students;
- that France was also economically motivated to turn more of her attention through the instrumentality of education to non-francophone countries rich in raw materials or capable of becoming good clients for French exports.

The avowed policy of the current Mitterand government is, as previously stated, to enhance the quality of education for foreign students and to reduce their chance of failure. (Statistics on foreign student performance were not available in any of the countries that I visited.) A document prepared by the National Ministry of Education grounds these new approaches to foreign student education in the French tradition of egalitarianism. It states that:

> The principles which must prevail in French universities concerning the acceptance of foreign students are based on the one hand on the equality of rights between Frenchmen and foreigners and on the other hand equality of level.

Equality of rights means that universities, within the framework of their autonomy, must maintain the same policies of acceptance, refusal, and placement for all applicants, whatever their nationality. Equality of level means that there are to be no "bargain diplomas"

("diplôme au 'rabais'"), no quotas, and the same expectation of equal performance at entry and at graduation.

The Ministry of Education statement goes on to stress the importance of mastery of the French language as a qualification for entrance:

> The ability of the student to follow university-level studies in France is a function of his level of comprehension of the French language.

Stressing the responsibility of the universities for decision-making, the document explains that each university has its own judges to assess these demonstrations of competence. The judges do not select the students but evaluate, in accordance with the pedagogic concerns of each university, the chance of the candidate to complete the course of study under the same conditions as their French classmates. Since each institution can maintain its own entrance level, it is understood that some institutions will be more rigorous in their egalitarianism than others.

The Ministry of Education document adds, however, that the linguistic and educational level of the candidate is only one aspect of foreign students admission policy. The quality of accomodation in the region and the availability of support services are also important. (As in other European countries support services in the American sense are not generally available on French campuses for either foreign or domestic students except in the area of health care.) This cannot be achieved, the document notes, unless students are proportionately distributed among the totality of universities ("se repartissent d'une manière harmonieuse dans l'ensemble des universités.") Their presence in the various regions of France can be an element of enlightenment ("rayonnement") for those areas. French students, too, the document is careful to note, are subject to conditions limiting their enrollment in universities in the Paris region. Unfortunately, the document adds, it is not always understood by foreigners that "a national diploma has the same value, whether it is awarded by one university or another." In what seems to be a very positive recent step, the Ministry of Education is preparing to have contracts with the universities to set up guidance programs for foreign students. Such services will be free; they can also be part of an exchange agreement between two universities.

Asserting that "France is honored" by the desire of foreign students to pursue their studies in France, the document states that the system

of preinscription abroad makes it easier for foreign students to benefit from prior information and creates a more equitable situation since not all students can afford to come to France as tourists in June or July to choose their universities and enroll in them.

The report concludes its analysis of current policy with the following statements meant to justify the demand that foreign students be admissible to higher education in their own countries.

> Having thus affirmed [both] the equality between foreigners and Frenchmen and the equality among foreigners, it remains necessary only to avoid introducing any contradiction between a policy of welcoming foreign students and the development of higher education in each of the countries of origin.

Nothing is stated about the need to preserve the academic quality of French universities. Instead the procedures introduced are once again justified on the basis of equality. For this reason candidates must, in order to enter French universities, present evidence of their ability to enter the same studies in their home country, unless prior agreement exists—as with EEC countries—for automatic granting of equivalency.

As can be seen from the preceding statements, France at this time grounds her policy in what is for her, as for other European nations, the very sensitive area of foreign student admissions on a classical egalitarianism that demands of all its students equal qualifications for entrance and exit from the university. Such a policy does have the value of being both fair and practical and of providing a logical basis for limitations in enrollment. Like all purely meritocratic admissions policies, however, such egalitarianism to some degree begs the question. Owing to the inequalities of educational systems elsewhere in the world, and particularly in many sections of the Third World, all foreign students do not compete equally with French students and are hence automatically denied the opportunity of bettering themselves. Faced with the same dilemma, Germany, as we shall see, has instituted a system of tuition-free *Studienkollegs*, designed to prepare the foreign student for entry into the German university system. At this time no such compensatory program exists nationally in France, although the University of Paris VII, which has one of the largest concentrations of foreign students in the country, has experimented with such an approach as a mode of achieving control over what it considered an unmanageable number of poorly qualified foreign students.

Paris VII, already noted as a university where response to the Imbert Decree was violent, had at one point a student body in which 17

percent of all enrollees were foreign students. According to administrators there, 70 percent of these foreign students were failing or dropping out as opposed to 50 percent of French students. Seeking to reduce the percentage of academically unqualified foreign students in a highly volatile student environment, the university instituted a language instruction center, half funded by university money and half funded by government money, in which students not capable of meeting minimum language proficiency standards were obliged to enroll. Admission to the university was dependent on passing the work of the institute. Since the capacity of the institute is limited by funding, the number of foreign student entrants to the university has begun to dwindle and is now at about 14 percent. This proportion will presumably diminish still further when funding stringencies will, it is predicted, force the university to restrict entrance into the language center to political refugees only. (That the university itself is intensely overcrowded—more than 30,000 students in a campus of only 900,000 square feet—has, curiously enough, not been used as an argument in limiting either foreign or French student enrollment although the physical dilapidation of the campus is startling.)

It may be, however, that a new direction is being sought. A spokesperson for the Ministry of Education reports that in the near future that agency is planning to organize long-term training programs on the basis of contracts with foreign governments or foreign private entrepreneurs to train groups of students in specific fields. A special curriculum will be prepared for them under the general heading of "influence éducative."

Future Goals and Directions

It is not easy to determine the direction of French policy regarding the use of scholarships and other forms of aid to affect positively the flow of foreign students from one country or another, or into one discipline or another. The report on foreign students in France prepared by the Institute of European Education and Social Policy states that: "It is paradoxically difficult to obtain statistical data on their activities from those agencies which award scholarships to foreign students (the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Cooperation)." The report does, however, note several interesting facts: (1) that foreign governments have been increasingly sharing the costs of awards with France; (2) that preference is shown in grantmaking for students in the third cycle, especially in science and technology; (3) that there are

special awards for students from former French colonies; and (4) that there are also scholarship programs for short training programs (*bourses de stages* as opposed to *bourses d'études*).

My own experiences parallel those of the European Institute researchers in that it seems difficult to get precise data on either the numbers of foreign students receiving awards or the policy goals served by such scholarships. In my discussions with ministers at the Cultural, Scientific, and Technological Bureau of the Foreign Office, the Director of Scientific and Technical Cooperation and the Bureau Head for the Education of French Scholarship Holders both stressed the small number of award recipients—15,000—relative to the large mass of foreign students generally and France's difficult economic situation. Asked where their priorities lay, given their stated funding limitations, both relied once again on the concept of equality or even-handedness. Scholarships were, they said, awarded equitably between developing and developed countries, although more scholarships were given to developing countries because they had more people and greater need. Both ministers at the Foreign Office seemed interested in the concept of targeted exchange programs in scientific and technological fields, presumably with the industrialized countries. Similar views were expressed by spokespersons at the Ministry of National Education. According to them, France's goals are to:

1. increase the proportion of foreign students at the third level while decreasing the number at the first level;
2. increase relationships with developed countries, through exchange programs stressing science and technology; but
3. not to diminish the number or proportion of students from the developing world.

Asked whether such exchange programs with developed countries are currently being implemented, the ministers indicated that such policies were only now evolving. Administrators at Paris VII and other French educators I met were also interested in similar approaches, speaking of East-West rather than North-South ties and stressing science and technology. These approaches are certainly not inconsistent with goals expressed in other European countries, but one wonders how they will be achieved under a totally decentralized system, where each university makes its own admissions decisions. There are also those who fear that the Mitterand approach of decentralized decision-making will accentuate the tendency toward a dual system, in which some universities accept a high proportion of foreign students while others have only a few.

Some Underlying Issues

Analyzing the data on foreign students in France once again points up the need for great care in making comparisons among various nations. One has to be very careful that one is comparing like with like and that the definition of what constitutes a foreign student is either consistent from one country to another or carefully explained in any presentation of statistics. What constitutes a foreign student in France, for example, is not always the same as a foreign student in the United States.

Some British observers express a similar caution in regard to the definition of higher education, stating that the entrance requirements for some French universities can only legitimately be compared to the level described as "non-advanced further education" in the UK. Several speakers in France and elsewhere found in the very open character of the French university reason to state that it is the academically weakest foreign student—at least at the undergraduate level—who chooses France.

The French experience also poses the question of saturation or overconcentration of foreign students. Both Paris VII and, even more, Paris VIII were cited by a number of observers as institutions where the number of foreign students was excessive, especially, in the case of Paris VIII, after large numbers of foreign students fleeing British high charges arrived there. Several former visitors to that campus used such phrases as "soukh" or "bazaar" to describe it, since it was apparently surrounded by sale booths and cooking stalls. Many of the graffiti at Paris VII testify to the transfer of foreign students' political concerns to college campuses away from home. The impact that such highly visible concentrations of foreign students, with their own distinctive cultures and political concerns, can have on public perception bears out the impression of some British observers that the large numbers of foreign students in a few British universities and colleges can have a disproportionate impact on the public mind.

However, French experience with the Imbert Decree points once again to the difficulties of any abrupt change in foreign student policy. Faced with a delicate issue, the French government has sought to justify its policy on grounds of equity rather than expense. The European Institute report phrases the differences between the British and French efforts to control foreign student numbers somewhat acerbically: If the English system, "which is based on the manipulation of the cost of access, is in a certain manner *blind* (in that it does not take into account the interests of the students and their countries), the

French system has. . .the defect of being totally *opaque* to the degree that the criteria of selection are in actuality far from being totally known" (since their actual implementation has been relegated to the individual university). Both the British and French experiences, it might be fairer to state, demonstrate the pitfalls of attempting to contain or reverse a flow of students that so clearly has implications for foreign trade and foreign relations and where policy measures can be easily misread. It should be noted that of all the European countries, France remains the most receptive to Third World students, whose proportions have been falling in both England and Germany.

That foreign students are important to France is apparent both from the repeated statements by French officials concerning the country's long tradition of welcome and from the high cost of supporting such students. France has maintained its relatively open policy in the face of numbers of foreign students far exceeding those in any other European country at the present time and percentages, in Paris at least, far exceeding those anywhere in the world. Although the French educational system, like the German one, is relatively inflexible in cost because of its large lecture method and the sacrosanct nature of tenure, the burden of educating more than 100,000 foreign students cannot be negligible, and a reduction in foreign student numbers would certainly reduce the overcrowding on a number of campuses. That France wishes to reduce the costs of educating so large a number of foreign students seems apparent from her new emphasis on exchanges rather than awards and on the technological benefits to be derived from contacts with the developed world rather than the benefits to be conferred through educational aid to the developing world. But it is also clear that France's traditionally cosmopolitan policy is still dominant, although apparently in the process of clarification and change.

THREE

Germany: Cosmopolitanism, Development, and Technology

The German policies toward foreign students are both well elaborated and clearly articulated. Although the German populace shares some of the ambivalent attitudes that can be seen in England and in France, the German government appears to place a high priority on all aspects of international education. A number of explanations can be given for the prominent attention given to foreign students and to educational exchanges and development assistance generally. One reason lies in Germany's long tradition of scientific leadership. In a period when industrial nations are placing a premium on scientific advancement as the key to economic prosperity, Germany is understandably making strenuous efforts to retain or regain her status as a world leader in science and technology. Behind the scientific tradition, however, lies the even older tradition of the medieval Germany university and its cosmopolitan student body. Spokespersons for international education often use the wandering scholar of the middle ages as a symbol for an intellectual internationalism that they would like to see revived.

Germany's geographic locale at the center of Europe is another source of her internationalism. As Dieter Danckwortt, Director of Documentation for the German Foundation for International Development (*Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung*) puts it:

> The central location of Germany. . .causes cultural, intellectual, and ideological movements from all four directions to meet in our country and be absorbed here; this in turn implies that Germany has always been a zone of unrest from where new impulses emanated; we have only to think of Martin Luther and Karl Marx. . . .Our neighbors have always considered this both a threat and an attraction.

31

If Germany is thus a crossroads for intellectual activity—and in recent years a main-traveled road and stopping point for foreign workers as well—she also lives in the shadow of two world wars. An acknowledged reason for Germany's interest in attracting foreign students and in actively pursuing development assistance is her need to reinstate herself, as a number of speakers put it, in the community of nations. The German Academic Exchange Service (*Deutscher Akademische Austauschdienst*, or DAAD) and the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation were both founded in the aftermath of World War I. The special nature and status of the German Fulbright Commission, as well as a number of other organizations, date from World War II. It is interesting that Germany, alone of the nations I visited, had an organization devoted to the analysis and coordination of development assistance for Third World countries, The German Foundation for International Development (*Deutsche Stiftung für Internationale Entwicklung*), and several other organizations devoted to educational assistance for refugees from Eastern bloc countries. All these organizations reflect historic influences and current commitments. But it must be stressed at the outset that, however much foreign student activities are coordinated and implemented by a decentralized set of organizations, the setting of foreign student policy in Germany is primarily a national matter.

Strengthening all these other motivations is Germany's linguistic situation. Although her former colonial empire was modest compared to that of England and France, Germany tries to keep up with her few former colonies and, more important, to cultivate her friendships with a wide range of countries, especially those in the developing world. While England rests secure in the knowledge that English is the dominant world language and while France struggles to keep French an international tongue, Germany is well aware that only three other countries—East Germany, Austria, and Switzerland—use German as an official language. Germany thus has strong reasons for supporting the overseas student as a vehicle for the eventual diffusion of a knowledge of German and German culture. Germany tends to minimize the purely pragmatic arguments for welcoming foreign students. Nevertheless, the economic and diplomatic ramifications of expanding the awareness of German language and culture are clearly important to her.

Despite this emphasis on foreign students and international exchanges, Germany, like France and England, has nonetheless been

introducing a number of more restrictive conditions for foreign students as their numbers and the overall number of immigrants continue to grow. A 1981 report on "The Situation of the Foreign Student" in German higher education passed by the Standing Conference of Ministers of Education of the Federal Republic of Germany (KMK) sounded a familiar note of alarm in pointing out the seemingly uncontrollable increase in the flow of students from Iran, Turkey, Greece, and Indonesia and questioned the quality of foreign students in general. Although the KMK report was supportive of foreign students in urging increased counseling services and programs for them, it simultaneously suggested a series of restrictions on their entrance into country, such as having to be admitted by a specific German university even before a short-term visa could be issued. A number of these recommendations in the 1981 report were implemented by the federal government in 1982 and 1983 despite the objections of a number of university heads, who particularly disliked the commingling of education and immigration policy. As in Great Britain several of the new policies were subsequently reversed when their practical consequences became clear, and other new policies are still under discussion. It is interesting to note that in Germany, as in England, the central government appeared to have acted on outdated information since by 1983 "excessive" student inflow from the four major sending countries was already beginning to come under control.

It must be remembered in assessing these actions that Germany does have serious immigration concerns owing to her 4.5 million guest workers, including 800,000 from Turkey alone. Although Germany had originally welcomed these workers during her boom period, the slowing of the Germany economy, the heavy concentrations of foreign national groups in various cities and regions, and the inevitable tensions engendered by unassimilated populations have all impacted on the German attitude toward foreign students. Related to this is the fairly widespread perception that foreign students are extending their stays unduly as a form of backdoor immigration. Some of the student-specific issues in Germany's new immigration regulations are being worked out, but the more general desire to limit immigration, to avoid high concentrations of particular national groups, and to limit the competition between foreign and German students for certain categories of scarce university places remains as a counterweight to Germany's otherwise welcoming policies.

Enrollment Trends and Space Limitations

In looking at the foreign student situation in Germany, it is well to keep three facts in mind: (1) the great escalation in foreign student numbers during the 1970s, (2) the relatively uneven distribution of these numbers among certain national groups and academic disciplines, and (3) the fact that German tuition is free for all students. The 1983 figure for foreign students in Germany was roughly 66,000—up from approximately 40,000 in 1972. These statistics would indicate an increase of about 65 percent over the decade and represent a foreign student population comprising a little over five percent of total enrollment in higher education. Because of the great increase in attendance rates for German students in higher education over the same period, these numbers represent a somewhat lesser proportion than existed previously, but a marked increase in absolute numbers. Foreign students in Germany represent a significantly smaller fraction of the total enrollment than they do in Britain or France, but they do put considerable pressure on frequently limited classroom spaces.

As previously noted, Iranian, Turkish, Greek, and Indonesian students comprise the largest factions of overseas students although there was a 440 percent increase in Cypriot students between 1976 and 1981, probably as a result of British fee policies. Approximately 80 percent of all foreign students are enrolled in the university sector and 20 percent in *fachhochshulen*, or professional-technical colleges, somewhat approximating the British polytechnics. Division by subject matters shows:

- 29.6 percent in liberal arts, fine arts and sports
- 28.5 percent in engineering
- 17.2 percent in economics and management
- 15.1 percent in mathematics and natural sciences
- 9.4 percent in medicine
- 2.5 percent in agriculture, forestry, and nutrition

The numbers in engineering contrast sharply with the low representation of foreign students in French engineering programs and, together with the 15 percent enrolled in mathematics and natural sciences, testify to Germany's continuing reputation in science and technology.

Defining a "foreign student," in Germany poses questions. In 1981 one third of all "foreign students" were actually residents in the Federal Republic. Such residents could include relatively short-term persons domiciled in Germany, such as the children of diplomats or

foreign military personnel. But they also include refugees and the children of foreign workers who may themselves have been born in Germany. These problems of definition occur in other countries as well, as has already been noted for France and England, but in Germany the issue seems potentially, if not currently, complicated by the presence of a permanent immigrant population, which does not seek or has not yet been awarded citizenship. Any analysis of the figures on resident foreign students must be carefully interpreted by national origin. Thus, the 1,303 American foreign students resident in the Federal Republic in 1981 probably represent the children of diplomats and military personnel, while the 1,431 resident Greeks are probably in large measure the children of guest workers. It is believed that relatively few such young people are currently enrolled in universities and *fachhochschulen*, partly for demographic reasons and partly owing to their failure to persist in secondary education. In the future, however, guest workers' children may be enrolled in larger numbers. Some spokespersons already fear that these German-born "foreign students" will ultimately have an undue competitive edge against true foreign nationals in such high-demand fields as medicine, thus undercutting Germany's desire to use her professional schools to serve students from underdeveloped countries.

Unlike Great Britain, Germany is still on the rising side of her demographic curve, which will not start to decline until about 1990. The total numbers of students enrolled in higher education continued to increase during the 1970s, although there is some evidence that qualified students are now holding back from entry into the university for fear that they may be "overqualified" for available jobs. (The legal requirement for paying higher salaries to university graduates apparently makes employers reluctant to hire them for jobs for which they may be "overqualified.") The employment situation, the fact that tuition is free, and that grants are available for approximately 40 percent of German students, leads to the tendency of those who do stay in higher education to persist for a long time. (The average university stay, for example, is 6.5 years, although courses normally run for only 4-6 years.) The presence of such perennial students, who postpone examinations or enroll for a degree in a second subject after completing the first one, contributes to the concern, expressed by some, that the quality of German higher education is being diminished by "drones" in the system. At the present time certain specific disciplines are unable to meet enrollment pressures, notably medicine,

law, sociology, and psychology. As a result, Germany has imposed quotas of six percent for beginning foreign students in medicine, dentistry, and pharmacy and eight percent in such other high-demand subjects as biology and architecture. The immigration authorities have also become more rigorous with foreign students extending their stays excessively. Although a number of commentators, such as the KMK, use foreign student length of stay as evidence that their academic quality and performance are inadequate, thoughtful analysts such as Karl Roeloffs of the DAAD see such persistence as evidence of motivation and commitment. This view has recently been backed up by a study conducted by the Higher Education Information System (*Hochschulinformationsystem*), a higher education research group in Hanover, which shows that overall attrition or noncompletion of studies by foreign student is not significantly higher than that of German students.

While higher education as a whole is still expanding, not all disciplines are growing equally, and there has been some effort to defund by attrition those areas which are underenrolled. In Germany, as in France, tenured faculty are members of the civil service and, as such, their dismissal is unthinkable. For this reason, some German educational leaders appear to be looking to the possibility of using foreign students during the 1990s in order to fill available places. But there is much division on this point. One knowledgeable speaker cites the possibility of 300,000 foreign students in Germany in the 1990s, some perhaps even studying in English; others are much more cautious in their predictions. A more universal point of agreement appears, as in England and France, to be a growing emphasis on the postgraduate student and an increased interest in East-West ties with the industrialized and technological countries. Expanded relationships with the United States are especially prized and there is considerable concern over the rising cost of higher education in America. As a result, German students who previously went to the most selective private institutions in the United States are now being redirected to high quality public universities. More than any other country I visited, Germany appears to be troubled by the declining percentage of her own students choosing to study abroad, although the 40,000 annual student inquiries reported by the United States embassy in Bonn suggest that such interest still exists.

The Cost of Education

In view of the intense British concern over the costs, it is surprising to see that no thought is currently being given in Germany or France to the possibility of imposing any differential fee, to say nothing of full-cost fees, on the foreign student. With tuition free since 1965 and student activity and social service fees a mere DM200 (approximately $75 in 1983) a year, each foreign student represents a considerable educational expenditure for the German government. Part of the reason for Germany's apparent lack of concern may be the tenure situation previously described and thus the high proportion of university costs which may be considered as fixed. Still, a rough calculation of the German expenditure for foreign students would indicate an expenditure of approximately DM 1 billion ($380 million) in 1982 (estimated at five percent of a total budget for tertiary education of DM 20 billion). Karl Roeloffs of DAAD estimates that even though the withdrawal of 66,000 study places would not result in equivalent savings, there is nonetheless a very substantial public cost in educating such numbers. These commitments include not only instructional costs, but sizeable contributions by the universities, *laender*, and federal government toward foreign student scholarships and the priority given to such students for scarce dormitory places. The sixteen free *Studienkollegs*, or preparatory schools for foreign students, represent an additional governmental contribution, as do the administrative costs of determining foreign educational equivalencies and reviewing the records of thousands of foreign student applicants. Germany's current expenditures for foreign students would thus seem to be about one and one-half times what Great Britain was reported to have been spending on foreign students in 1980 (£150 million = $225 million) just before the imposition of full-cost fees.

Germany's response to the question of quality and of national representation has been a tightening of entrance qualifications for foreign students. As in France, current regulations take as their fundamental principle equivalency of qualifications and readiness for study. A brochure published by the Ministry of Education and Science states that,

> The basic requirement for the admission of foreigners to a course of studies is proof of previous education in which the marks gained in the applicant's native land would make a studies course feasible here, as well as proof of knowledge which would make such studies a

"practical proposition" at a German higher educational institution. In addition, proof of the necessary knowledge of the German language must also be produced.

Since there is no national examination for college entrance comparable to the A-levels in Great Britain, establishing the equivalency for foreign credentials is important. For students from countries which have signed the European Convention on the recognition of diplomas, their own secondary school leaving exam is regarded as equivalent to the German *abitur*. Foreign students, to quote the Ministry of Education and Science once again, "whose education in their home country would entitle them to a course of studies, but who have no previous knowledge to make their direct admission to a university a 'practical proposition'. . .must sit for an examination before commencement of studies." To help prepare for such an examination, Germany gives foreign students from developing countries the unique opportunity to study free of charge at a *Studienkolleg*. There is at least one Studienkolleg in each of the *laender* for a total of 17. The total number of available places for 1982-83 was somewhat more than 2,355. Instruction in the German language is available at the Goethe Institute, although that is not free, and at an increasing number of universities. Although final judgment on admissions is left to the individual university, some thought is being given to the development of a standard test of German language that would parallel the functions of the TOEFL exam. It should be noted that 37,000, or 55 percent, of Germany's foreign students come from Third World countries. Some commentators believe these numbers have gone down in recent years. If so, it would confirm a tendency noted elsewhere.

Unlike English or French universities, all Germany universities have International Students Offices ("Akademisches Auslandamt—für ausländische Studienbewerber und Studenten" The directors of those offices appear to combine elements of the roles played by international education directors and foreign student counselling heads on American campuses and seemingly enjoy considerable status. They are responsible for the development of exchange programs, the review of credentials, and the counselling of foreign students. Frequently their portfolios include relations with visiting researchers and guest lecturers as well as students.

In addition to maintaining a relatively open door to students from abroad, Germany also encourages her own students to study abroad,

either as part of exchange schemes or independently. Although some concern has been expressed about diminished interest in such study by German students, the figures through 1980 show no decline in absolute numbers, although the percentage of university students going abroad declined from 3.3 percent in 1969 to 2.6 percent in 1980, when 17,071 students studied abroad. Of these, 3,310 were enrolled in the United States. Hope was expressed by a number of speakers that the numbers of students engaged in German-American exchanges could be increased. As in France, emphasis is increasingly being placed on graduate students and on carefully targeted schemes of exchange.

Educational Agencies In Bonn and West Berlin

Martin Kenyon and Peter Williams have remarked that Germany employs a number of major agencies to fulfill the functions of a single organization, the British Council. It is difficult to compare the relative effectiveness of the two kinds of structures, but the German approach is clearly multi-faceted and seemingly well reasoned. One interesting priority is the attention being given to identifying the most useful kinds of development aid. Another priority is the emphasis given by Germany to retaining her international prestige in science. If the former goal leads Germany to seemingly generous programs in relation to developing countries, the latter leads her to a strong interest in East-West ties and in sharing and participating in the technological advances of the most highly industrialized nations. A few of the agencies concerned with international education are cited below, but it must be stressed that the listing is only partial.

BONN:

Cultural Division of the Foreign Office (Kultur Abteilung des Auswartigen Amtes): According to an unpublished study by Martin Kenyon and Peter Williams, one-third of the Foreign Office Budget (DM 692 million) is for culture. Of this, 40 percent is for the maintenance of German schools abroad, academic exchanges, and domestic cultural activities. Of special interest is the existence of extensive exchanges with the People's Republic of China — approximately 800 at the present time, of whom one-half are paid for by the German government. The Foreign Office has been concerned by issues surrounding the immigration status of foreign students and has specifically worked with the problems of Afgans and Iranians faced with threatening conditions in their own countries. Although foreign

political problems occasionally spill over on to German campuses, this is apparently not a significant problem.

DAAD (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst, or *German Academic Exchange Service):* DAAD was founded in 1925 as part of German's efforts to reintegrate herself into the community of nations following World War I. Its mandate is to promote "international university relations in tertiary education, especially academic and scientific exchange between the Federal Republic of Germany and foreign countries." Scholars, professors and students representing all disciplines, including the arts, from almost every country in the world participate in this exchange. It is also charged with educational assistance to Third World Countries.

A registered association under private law, DAAD has as its members the universities and students represented in the West German Rectors Conference. Its Executive Committee is made up of leading figures from the academic world. Its Board of Trustees is composed of representatives of the federal and state governments and organizations involved in the promotion of scholarship and science. One knowlegeable British analyst sees DAAD as superior to Britain's newly formed IDG (Interdepartmental Group) because of these ties to the universities themselves.

Funding for DAAD mainly comes from the Foreign Office, the Ministry of Education and Science, the Ministry for Economic Cooperation, and the states of the Federal Republic of Germany. Total budget for DAAD was about DM 180 million for 1981, up from DM 1.8 million in 1955. It is a sign of Germany's far-ranging interests that DAAD has branch offices in London, Paris, New York, Cairo, New Delhi, Rio de Janeiro, Nairobi, and Tokyo.

DAAD identifies three major functions for itself:

- promoting education, further education and research in higher education by the awarding of scholarships to foreign and German students, trainees, junior faculty, and professors;
- recruiting, placing, and financing German teaching staff in all disciplines in long-term and short-term teaching assignments abroad; and
- fostering the exchange of information between the Federal Republic of Germany and foreign countries through the issuing of publications, the sponsoring and coordinating of information visits by foreign and German academics, student groups, and others engaged in higher education.

Additional programs include scholarships for foreign students and younger academics, scholarships for German students and younger academics, a DAAD Artists-in-Berlin Programme, practice-related training for students of engineering and natural science, study visits for foreign academics, exchange of higher education teaching staff, cooperation agreements with foreign higher eduction institutions, placement of academic teaching staff, information visits, and follow-up contacts with former students and faculty.

German Fulbright Commission: Founded after World War II, the Fulbright Commission was the first institution in which the Germans had equal voice with the Americans. This historical background is said to have enhanced the early prestige of the Commission, which is now 80 percent funded by the German government and 20 percent by the American government. German relationships under the Fulbright program tend to be with research universities in the United States. As previously noted, with rising costs German students are said to be turning away from Harvard, MIT, and other private schools and going instead to public universities such as Colorado or Minnesota, or the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The Fulbright Commision works very closely with DAAD, since students not qualified under one set of programs may be ideally qualified for another.

Carl-Duisberg Society: This organization, dealing with foreign students from all geographic areas, handles the entire sector of *Fachhochschulen*, the professional-technical colleges.

The Alexander von Humboldt Foundation: Founded in 1860, the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation has been reestablished twice—in 1925 after World War I and in 1953 after World War II. "The purpose of the Foundation is to award research fellowships to young, academically trained, and highly qualified persons of foreign nationality, regardless of their sex, race, religion, or ideology, to enable them to carry out research projects in the Federal Republic of Germany, and to maintain academic contacts resulting therefrom."

More than any other organization I encountered, the Humboldt Foundation carries on the tradition of international scholarship and the dispassionate pursuit of knowledge. The Foundation also reflects Germany's pride in its historic leadership in science. The highly competitive fellowships of the Foundation are awarded to scholars and researchers aged 25-40 with Ph.D.'s and with outstanding records of publication. Account is taken, however, of the comparative research conditions in the scholar's country of origin so that individuals from

developing countries may compete on a basis of equality. A U.S. Special Awards Programme for scientists, engineers, and physicians testifies again to the special esteem in which American higher education is held. An interesting aspect of the Foundation's work is its effort to maintain contact with former fellows. Worth repeating as an evidence of foreign perceptions of the United States is the regret expressed by its Director, Dr. Heinrich Pfeiffer, that neither the United States government nor its leading foundations appear to be placing much emphasis on international scholarly exchange. Where, asked Dr. Pfeiffer, is the counterpart of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation in the United States?

German Foundation for International Development (Deutsche Stiftung fur Internationale Enwicklung): This interesting organization has two major purposes: coordination of a broad array of public and private organizations and activities related to development assistance and research into "the conditions, processes and effects found when people meet people from other cultures in their own or in a foreign country." In addition to organizing training programs and conferences, the foundation serves as a clearinghouse of information on all development activities in Germany and publishes an annual review. The foundation also answers all inquiries in regard to development and refers them to the appropriate agency.

According to Dr. Dieter Danckwortt, Director of Documentation and Information for the foundation, Germany was reluctant in the immediate post-war period to involve itself in highly sensitive development activities but was pushed into it by the United States in the late 1950s. He sees German motivations for development activities as a combination of humanitarian and pragmatic reasons. Concern for world hunger and such philanthropic activities as those undertaken by the churches are one part of the picture. The desire to increase current exports and to increase the purchasing power of developing countries over the long term by raising their standard of living is also a complementary part. As Danckwortt himself phrases it, "If Germany wants to survive and the standard of living of its inhabitants is not to decrease, international stability and peace must prevail, and Germany must have good relations with as many countries as possible, including countries outside Europe."

WEST BERLIN:

As in most other areas of government and education, West Berlin has separate structures from those of the rest of Germany, although DAAD does maintain a sizeable office there. Some organizations in West Berlin dealing with foreign students and programs are parallel to those in Bonn; others are complementary or reflect special Berlin interests. Among them are the:

- *Senator fur Wissenschaft und Forschung, or Ministry for Science and Research.* This education ministry coordinates all educational data for West Berlin, including information on foreign students.
- *Wissenschaftkolleg zu Berlin:* This newly formed institute is in some ways comparable in its aims to the Alexander von Humboldt Institute. Its goal is to advance knowledge for its own sake and to foster international scholarship. Modeled after the Princeton Institute of Advanced Study, the Wissenschaftkolleg also admits German scholars as fellows. Again, one of the goals of the Institute seems to be reinforcing the role and public perception of Germany as a leader in science and the liberal arts.
- *Otto Benecke Stiftung* This foundation is funded by the government for two purposes:
- (1) to provide stipends to expatriates from former German countries and to refugees; and
- (2) to assist students from developing countries who cannot study in their own countries because of political disturbances or who, for reasons other than academic failure, choose or are obliged to interrupt studies in the Soviet Union or other Eastern bloc countries.
- *Zentrum fur Technologische Zusammenarbeit;* This Center is part of the Technische Universität of Berlin, reporting directly to the President. The Center serves developing countries by providing programs for Third World students already enrolled in the University, for whom the combination training and internship activities provided by the Center form a useful bridge between formal training of a traditional nature and the actual needs of emerging nations. Students in the program work both in Germany and in their home country on practical research programs. Such studies thus form a meeting ground between the university curriculum and student needs.

A Look At East Berlin

Because of West Berlin's location, attention is paid to developing educational statistics for East Germany. The *Gesamtdeutsches Institut Bundesanstalt für Gesamtdeutsche Aufgabe* is specifically devoted to compiling such statistics, an often difficult task. The *Pedagogisches Zentrum* also records East German enrollment figures. It evaluates the credentials of students from the GDR seeking to transfer to educational institutions in West Germany and maintains a large collection of GDR textbooks. The following information about education in East Germany is gathered from interviews with spokespersons at both the Institute and the Center.

The GDR has 278 tertiary institutions. These include:

- 15 universities
- 14 specialized institutions such as military colleges
- 240 professional schools
- 9 higher schools for engineers.

During the period 1951 to 1980 a total number of 17,500 foreign students were enrolled in East German schools and 15,000 received their degrees. Some sense of the escalation of numbers in the last few years can be derived from the fact that the cumulative number of students enrolled jumped to 20,000 by 1982 and that 9,500 foreign students were enrolled in that year. Of the 17,500 enrolled before 1980 it is known that

- 7,500 students came from Europe
- 10,000 came from the Third World
  - 6,000 from 33 Asian countries, especially Vietnam
  - 3,000 from 49 African countries
  - 1,000 from 27 American countries

Former German colonies, SWAPO and the PLO are all sources of students for the GDR.

Like the Federal Republic, the GDR offers developmental programs for foreign students whose backgrounds are inadequate for college-level work. Although students from socialist countries will have customarily learned German from GDR instructors in their home countries, all students needing German instructions and those needing further preparatory work in academic subjects will be sent to the Herder Institute, the Karl Marx Institute or to one of 14 additional centers which now prepare students.

The East German government follows a number of interesting policies in regard to foreign students. While in Germany, foreign

students must share a room with a GDR student. They are not permitted to remain in Germany after the completion of their studies, but contact is assiduously maintained through clubs and other linkages. East Germany is said to be very proud of the accomplishments of her returned students, especially in Africa. As part of the national goal of strengthening ties among the community of socialist countries, foreign students in East Germany are expected to study the principles of Marxism and Leninism. With a very few exceptions, all instruction is in German although, as noted above, German is also taught *sur place* in socialist countries abroad.

There are apparently quite extensive eductional exchanges between the USSR and the GDR. Six hundred university teachers in East Germany were trained in the USSR and the USSR is the largest single foreign nation recipient of East German students. In keeping with its development goals, East Germany also devotes attention and resources to assisting in the development of Third World educational systems. (It is an interesting footnote in this regard that exchanges between the Federal Republic and West Berlin and the USSR are minimal. The Free University of Berlin reports some success in having USSR scientists as visiting faculty but very little desire on the part of their own Russian language students to study in the USSR even as part of a defined program).

Directions In German Policy

Although the changes in German foreign student policy have been moderate compared to those implemented by Great Britain, some time will be needed to assess the impact of some of the new immigration regulations and entrance requirements on the total numbers and composition of the German foreign student population. It also remains to be seen whether the desired shift to graduate study occurs and whether Germany will attain her goal of even further reinforcing her educational relations with the United States. Although one of Germany's chief goals has been to strengthen the academic qualifications of entering foreign students, the existence of the *Studienkollegs* would seem to demonstrate that her approach is not simply exclusionary and that the government is willing to invest resources into helping talented foreign students overcome the deficiencies of their educational background. It must be remembered in all matters pertaining to foreign students that the specific implementation of broad governmental policies takes place at the level

of the *laender* and that the universities themselves retain considerable autonomy. What is true for one section of Germany or for one university may well not be true for another. Unlike Great Britain, however, Germany does not appear to have rejected out of hand the notion that foreign student numbers might be increased to absorb excess university capacity in the 1990s.

The German government appears to be sensitive to the question of adapting education to the actual needs of developing countries, as shown by the existence of various sandwich programs which involve education both in Germany and the home country. Germany also appears to devote considerable attention to following up its foreign students. Still, attitudinal studies of foreign students in Germany have occasionally revealed the same kinds of disappointments and dissatisfactions on their part as were shown in the Overseas Students Trust's Grubb Institute Report. Despite what appears to be a considerably more extensive system of counseling and advising foreign students in Germany than that which has existed up to now in Britain or France, non-European foreign students still report a sense of alienation and a sense that they are not welcome. Such feelings may be one reason for stressing *sur place* studies.

The German experience also points up another aspect of the foreign student issue, and that is the importance of scientific knowledge. Such technical expertise is the present-day equivalent of fertile land, cattle, gold, and spices—the economic riches that impelled travels and mass migrations in the past. That more than 55 percent of the foreign students in Germany are enrolled in engineering, mathematics, medicine, or natural science is a sign that she is believed to possess these riches. Germany itself, however, is interested in enhancing her scientific reputation and in acquiring the benefits of the presence of foreign scientists and researchers. Part of this may be a nostalgia for Germany's past scientific glory, part a desire to encourage purchase of German microscopes or other scientific equipment, but part of this is surely a wish to acquire the fundamental economic capacity conferred by technical expertise.

Germany's increasing desire for closer educational ties with the United States would seem to be largely related to the desires for technological and scientific information, an acknowledgement of America's leadership in these areas. It is also impelled, as noted before, by a wish to strengthen relationships with Germany's most powerful ally. It is therefore instructive to conclude by taking note once again of

some of her previously mentioned disappointments in the United States: in the barriers presented by our high tuition policies, lack of scholarships or formal exchange programs, restrictions on visas and on work by foreign students, and perceived lack of commitment to international programs related to Western Europe on the part of America's leading foundations. Appreciation does exist for all that has been done, but Germany clearly would like to see increased mutual educational activity.

FOUR

Conclusions and Recommendations

A number of lessons may be drawn from the experience of Britain, France, and Germany in regard to foreign student policy. Some of them indicate the need for further study and discussion. Others, I believe, show us the possibilities for direct and positive action. This study demonstrates that foreign student policy cannot be considered in isolation. It is closely intertwined not only with a nation's educational policy and systems, but with its economic conditions, its demographic projections, its internal social pressures, and its foreign policy and foreign trade priorities. As we compare the United States with Britain, France, and Germany, it is important to recognize both the similarities and differences between the Western European countries and ourselves.

One major difference is, of course, the level of foreign student enrollments in America and in the three countries we have examined. The United States does have in absolute numbers the highest foreign student population in the world. It is the large and—until recently—rapidly rising numbers of such students and the absence of policies in regard to their recruitment, admission, financing, education, and educational support, as well as the issue of federal regulatory policies—that have prompted such recent studies as ACE's *Foreign Students and Institutional Policy: An Agenda for Action* and IIE's *Absence of Decision: Foreign Students in American Colleges and Universities: a report on policy formation and the lack thereof.* The issues raised by these studies have still not been adequately resolved at the institutional or governmental level and must continue to be pursued.

At the same time we should realize that the percentage of foreign student enrollments in the United States is still very small in relation to that experienced by the other receiving countries we have been examining. With only 2.7 percent of its student population of foreign origin, according to the most recent IIE statistics, the ratio of foreign

enrollments in the United States is less than one-quarter that of France, roughly one-third that of Great Britain, and only three-fifths that of Germany. (These differentials still hold relatively true even when we modify these figures to recognize the fact that France and Germany include the children of foreign immigrants among their foreign student population.) Had the number of foreign students in the United States continued to escalate in the straight linear projection some analysts were predicting a few years ago, we might, indeed, have reached by the 1990s a condition more similar to that of the Western European democracies. To be sure, even now some states and some institutions do have very high proportions of foreign students. But in view of the leveling off of foreign student enrollments that is currently taking place, the United States has no reason to fear either the pressures of cost or of "culture clash" that have led to the more restrictive policies adopted abroad. Under the proper conditions, there would appear to be considerable room for expansion of the foreign student population in America.

Another difference between the United States and Europe that must be taken into account if we wish to develop a coherent national policy toward foreign students is the far greater degree to which American higher education is decentralized. Although the federal government can and does have a role in establishing foreign student policy, the individual states and, even more so, the individual universities and colleges are largely responsible for the recruitment, education, and financing of foreign students.

However, if decentralization poses its difficulties in regard to establishing a coherent and consistent foreign student policy, too great a degree of centralization has its penalties as well. Much of the difficulty experienced by Great Britain in implementing its full-cost policies could have been averted by closer coordination between the government and the universities themselves and some of the awkward reversals of policy perhaps avoided. The recent history of France and Germany in regard to foreign students shows some similar tensions between the centralized educational authorities and the universities themselves, with Germany perhaps faring somewhat better precisely because of the existence of organizations that mediate between the federal government and the university system. The implication for us in the United States would seem to me the necessity for close coordination between the federal government and the major educational associations representing the different categories of

colleges and universities, as new programs for foreign students are developed or foreign student policy is modified.

Of great importance to the development of a rational policy in regard to foreign student enrollments are national demographic projections, for they help inform us whether or not there is room for additional students from abroad within the existing educational system and whether their cost is additive or marginal. Here the United States is demographically more similar to Great Britain, whose student-age population is peaking, rather than to France or Germany, where the demographic crest of college-age students is still to come. It is interesting in this regard to look at British policy—both formal and informal. Government spokespersons in Britain are very clear about the need to contract the educational system and have, indeed, been taking drastic measures to reduce the university budgets. The British authorities appear unwilling to fill empty places by expanding educational opportunity within the domestic population or by increasing foreign student enrollments. However, the flexible fee policy currently being implemented seems somewhat at variance with this stated policy, since it will enable educational institutions to take in foreign students on a program-by-program basis as long as they can prove there is no cost or that, indeed, there is a profit involved. The active recruitment efforts abroad by many British institutions and the "market surveys" being conducted by the British Council to assist university recruitment abroad would thus seem to speak to a somewhat contradictory policy, which does at one level acknowledge the practical benefits of foreign students to a shrinking educational system.

Here in the United States the demographic decline is already upon us. One would hardly endorse wholesale recruitment of foreign students simply as a means of filling empty seats with live bodies (although there is evidence that this has occurred in some cases). But the United States will be faced with excess capacity at a time when many developing nations still have not established their educational systems, especially at the graduate level. A positive and carefully directed effort to reach out to students and institutions from such countries could be of benefit both to the United States in averting the threatened implosion of some of its college and university systems and in assisting underdeveloped nations in fulfilling their still-unmet needs for advanced study. Such policies would have to be carefully developed to avoid simply draining Third World countries of the students that they do need to sustain their own systems or to allow certain American

disciplines, as is already happening in some graduate fields, to avoid facing their domestic problems by enrolling an extraordinary percentage of foreign students. But the promise of mutual benefit does exist. Another policy issue, although possibly of lesser priority, would be to examine the complaint of such Western European nations as Germany that our tuition costs are pricing their students out of the market and that the United States is still not sufficiently open to educational exchanges.

That such mutual benefit may not occur simply through an open door policy, however, is also demonstrated by the European experience. Britain, France, and Germany have each experienced disproportionate enrollments from a limited number of foreign countries and these enrollments have usually been based on historical considerations rather than current policy priorities. Certainly in Great Britain and, as we are beginning to see, in the United States high-priced policies appear to be creating a trend toward wealthier students from the wealthier foreign countries at the same time that the number of students from many of the developing countries diminishes. The most recent IIE statistics for the United States point out a loss of students from many of the developing countries of Africa and Central and South America in addition to other shifts in enrollment patterns. These may not be the goals the United States would have chosen, but they are likely to continue to be the end result of a policy vacuum.

In Europe, more than in America, foreign student policy is increasingly viewed as a valuable adjunct to foreign policy. Indeed, it was the failure to realize this relationship that led to the British debacle of 1980 when an educational decision to impose full-cost fees on foreign students was initiated without the consent of the Foreign Office. The international explosion that took place is well known. What is less commonly recognized, however, is that it was not only the Foreign Office but the international corporate community that led to the reversals of that policy which have subsequently taken place. As we have seen, it was the Overseas Students Trust that played a critical role in the development of the subsequent "Pym package," with its many concessions for students from favored nations. But the Overseas Students Trust is financed by British and transnational companies and a chief buttress for its arguments in favor of foreign students was the poll of forty transnational companies conducted in 1980. The results of this poll were very positive, practical endorsements of the importance of overseas education in reinforcing trade relationships and in providing a vital core of future foreign managers.

The German experience also supports the practical arguments in behalf of the importance of foreign students and foreign educational assistance. Although Germany has, as we have seen, a number of commingled motives for her very positive foreign student policies, one of the most forcible rationales her spokespersons cite is the importance of strengthening the educational and technical capacity of underdeveloped countries in order to increase their buying power and to assist in achieving world peace by reducing poverty and, hence, tension.

Looking back at the lessons to be derived from the experience of Britain, France, and Germany, four major points can be cited: (1) that proportionately speaking the United States still has considerable room to expand her foreign student population without, it would seem, experiencing the costs, pressures, and tensions that have affected Western European policies; (2) that in both centralized and decentralized systems of higher education close coordination between the national government and the educational system is essential in formulating useful policy; (3) that the United States' different demographic projections can lead her to an expansionary policy in regard to foreign students, but that such policy needs careful formulation if we are not simply to attract wealthy students from wealthy nations or disproportionate numbers of students in certain disciplines; and (4) that the European experience shows very clearly the pragmatic importance of foreign students in relationship to foreign policy and foreign trade.

What the European experience does not show, except rather wistfully, is the importance of foreign students in ways that cannot fully be assessed by pragmatic tests. We are seriously in need of some values clarification in regard to the significance of foreign students and academic interchanges more generally. As the German priorities show, nations are very certain about the benefits of scientific exchanges. But what about the more general cultural advantages to be derived from educational interactions among students and faculty from different nations? The interpenetration of cultures through the interchange of students and scholars within an academic community is in itself a source of new knowledge and broadened perspectives. It can also contribute to the development of a world culture other than the transnational culture we seem to be developing of international technology and mass media—a growing uniformity that makes all airports and commercial centers look alike and that makes a shopping

mall in Bangkok virtually indistinguishable from one in Baltimore or Boston. Such a world culture developed through expanded educational interchanges would not be at odds with technology—certainly not at odds with internationalism—but it would preserve for all nations the traditions and values that are frequently lost in the transition to industrialization.

One of the problems of foreign student policy both here and abroad is that it has tended to be viewed as a one-sided conferral of benefits rather than as an opportunity for greater mutuality and exchange. There is still great need for the more developed educational systems to assist students and institutions in emerging nations, but it is also time to start moving in many cases toward more egalitarian relationships. As we do so—as we increasingly see the education of students from abroad as a network of mutual benefits and obligations rather than a one-sided sending and receiving relationship—it may be that the older concept of an international community of scholars will once again become a vital force.

I should like to end this report by making some specific recommendations for action based on my European experiences and voicing a more general view of the importance at this time of a coherent and positive American policy in regard to foreign students.

(1) I should like to repeat the recommendation made in the ACE report, *Foreign Students and Institutional Policy,* for the creation of a task force on foreign student policy. This suggestion, made by an ACE committee of which I was a member, calls for the convening of a "task force broadly representative of U.S. institutions of higher education and of the professional associations with particular concern for foreign students. . . .to identify data and research needs; to establish mechanisms to benefit institutions of higher education in making decisions about foreign students; to converse with government officials who have responsibility in the development of foreign policy with respect to foreign students and scholars; and to share information with other host nations, particularly those in the North Atlantic Community."

This recommendation seems to me to have become increasingly important in the two years that have elapsed since the ACE study first appeared. At a time when we see growing interest in government bodies, especially in the Congress, in foreign students and educational exchanges, we must be mindful that many influential lawmakers and executive branch officials have insufficient information about the

dimensions of exchanges. They lack also a historical perspective on the several decades of exchanges and what we have learned from them. The benefits and advantages of their legislative initiatives could unfortunately be minimized or unrealized by their not having a fuller understanding of the implications of their recommendations. Governmental interaction with the academic community, with its direct experience of foreign students and scholarly exchanges, can be most helpful here.

The ACE recommendation for a task force should also probably be expanded to include members of the corporate community. One important lesson learned from the British is the value of a corporate perspective as well as corporate support when discussing these issues with government. Obviously, there are real differences between academe and industry, but the realities of future relations which develop as a result of international education are witnessed daily in the corporate world.

(2) I should also like to expand the concept of such a task force beyond the confines of the United States. The common fundamental issues of funding, adjustment problems, appropriateness of academic programs to the philosophical questions of value and purpose, all concern the large receiving countries. The Ditchley Park meeting of 1980 was greatly useful in bringing together representatives of the United States, North Atlantic Community, and Commonwealth nations. Such an international conference, conducted perhaps on a triennial basis, and expanded, where feasible, to include representatives from sending nations as well, could serve as a useful clearinghouse for the exchange of information and experiences and for the development of international goals and guidelines in regard to foreign student programs.

The European experience shows that drift is alluring, precipitate action dangerous, thoughtful and constructive policy difficult but not impossible to achieve. America is still far from experiencing the costs or proportions of foreign students or the internal social pressures that have led Britain, France, and Germany to their more deliberately restrictive policies of recent years. But America is also losing a national opportunity. It is not simply an opportunity to help sustain educational enrollments through a transition period by means of greater foreign student enrollments, although that is a consideration for many institutions and state systems. It is an opportunity for this country to reach out toward those students, those nations, those areas of

international research and development that we wish to encourage in our own best interests and in the interest of greater world understanding. These goals cannot be pursued in the absence of information or without knowing what works and what does not and what it costs; hence, the importance I have placed on both national and international forums of discussion and informational interchange. The few recent proposals that we have seen at the national level toward more positive academic exchange and training programs are undoubtedly valuable. But they remain, for the time being, simply isolated initiatives, unframed by larger policy goals. Both our intrinsic national values and our own good sense as we look to the future roles of these students show us the need for more clearly defined objectives and for more substantive and coordinated activities in regard to foreign students and other educational assistance and training programs. The opportunity for carefully considered policies and programs of international education lies very much before us. We would do well to grasp the chance for leadership.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In preparing this report I have largely relied on interviews with educators and officials in the three countries that I visited. I should like to acknowledge the assistance and courtesy of the following persons:

Great Britain:

Alison Barty, Assistant Executive Secretary, UKCOSA (United Kingdom Council for Overseas Student Affairs); Dr. David Bethel, Director, Leicester Polytechnic; Rupert Brown, Head of Student Services, Polytechnic Institute of the South Bank, London; Jack Butterworth, Vice Chancellor, University of Warwick, and Chairman, Interuniversity and Polytechnic Council for Higher Education Overseas; Michael Caine, Chairman, Booker Mc Connell, and Chairman of the Board, UKCOSA; Dr. A. Christodolou, Secretary General, Association of Commonwealth Universities; T. Craig, Assistant Secretary General, Association of Commonwealth Universities; M. S. Dalziel, Controller, Higher Education Division, British Council; J. W. Daniel, Cultural Relations Department, Foreign and Commonwealth Office; Nigel Harthy, World University Services; Dr. R. O. Iredale, Principal Education Adviser, Overseas Development Administration; Martin Kenyon, Director, Overseas Students Trust; Professor A. D. Low, Churchill College, Cambridge; J. E. C. Macrae, Head of Cultural Relations Office, Foreign and Commonwealth Office; Sir Roy Marshall, Vice Chancellor, University of Hull, and Chairman, Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility; Andy Masseter, Assistant Executive Secretary, UKCOSA; James Murray, Churches Commission on Overseas Students; P. T. Perris, Overseas Development Administration; Martin Philips, Cultural Relations Department, Foreign and Commonwealth Office; Ray Rickett, Director, Middlesex Polytechnic; Trevor Rutter, Assistant Director General, British Council; Valerie Shawcross, Assistant Executive Secretary, UKCOSA; Thomas Soper, Consultant on EEC Affairs and Trustee and Deputy Chairman, Overseas Students Trust; Brian Taylor, Committee of Vice Chancellors and Principals; Professor Frank Thistlethwaite, Vice Chairman, Inter-University and Polytechnic Council for Higher Education Overseas; John H. Thomson, Department of Education and Science; Jack Thornton, Department of Education and Science; John Weston, Marketing Adviser, Higher Education Division, British Council; Ray Whitney, Foreign Secretary, Foreign and Commonwealth Office; Professor Peter Williams, Commonwealth Secretariat.

France:

Geneviève Ramos Acker, Head of American Section, Franco-American Commission for Educational Exchange; Martin Ackerman, Franco-American Commission; Ladislav Czerych, Director, European Institute of Education and Social Policy; Jean Dallemagne, Vice President for International Relations, University of Paris VII; Serge Françoise, Chef de Bureau de la Formation des Boursiers Francais à l'Etranger, Direction Générale des Relations Culturelles, Scientifiques et Techniques, Ministère des Relations Extérieures; Jean-Loup Motchane, Directeur de la Coopération Scientifique, Direction Générale des Relations Culturelles, Scientifiques et Techniques, Ministere des Relations Extérieures; George Papadopoulos, Deputy Director for Education, Organization for Economic Development and Cooperation (OECD); Bernard Poli, Direction de la Coopération et des Relations Internationales, Ministère de l'Education Nationale; Claude Van Reeth, University of Paris VII; Dr. Raymond E. Wanner, Education Attaché, United States Permanent Delegation, UNESCO.

Germany

Dr. Hans Bungert, Rector, University of Regensberg; Dr. T. C. Chung, Center for Technical Cooperation, Technical University of Berlin; Dr. Dieter Danckwortt, German Foundation for International Development; Dr. Meinolf Dierkes, Wissenschaftzentrum; Ulrike Dolezal, Bundesministerium für Bildung und Wissenschaft; Ferdinand Dolz, Otto Beinecke Foundation; Dr. Arnold Ébel, DAAD; Dorothea Fitterling, External Academic Affairs Office, Technical University of Berlin; Dr. Horst Hartwich, External Affairs Office, Free University of Berlin; Dr. Hannelore Hegel, Division of Science and Higher Education, Bureau of Science and Research, Berlin; Dr. Wigbert Holle, Foreign Academic Affairs Office, University of Bonn; Eckhard Kampfer, Gesamtdeutsches Institut Bundesanstalt für Gesamtdeutsche Aufgaben; Dr. Ulrich Littman, Fulbright Commission; Mr. Lockmann, Pedagogisches Zentrum; Dr. Klaus Meyer, Osteuropa Intitut; Dr. Joachim Nettelbeck, Secretary, Wissenschaftskolleg of Berlin; Dr. Rudiger Pernice, German Foundation for International Development; Dr. Heinrich Pfeiffer, General Secretary, Alexander von Humboldt Foundation; Dr. Karl Roeloffs, Secretary General, DAAD, (Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst); Frau Dr. Theodor, Cultural Affairs Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Hans N. Tuch, United States Embassy, Bonn; Dr. Hans Wegener, DAAD, Berlin.

Note: Where practicable I have anglicized the names of foreign organizations and agencies.

SELECTED LIST OF WORKS CONSULTED

Great Britain

British Council, *The British Council Annual Report 1982-83.*

Commonwealth Secretariat, *Educational Interchange: A Commonwealth Imperative,* Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility, First Report, July, 1982.

Department of Education and Science, "Future demand for higher education in Great Britain," *DES Report on Education,* Number 99, April 1983.

Department of Education and Science, "Overseas Students in Great Britain in 1981-82 and Provisional Information for 1982-83," *Statistical Bulletin,* June 1983 and June 1984.

Foreign and Commonwealth Office, "A Policy for Overseas Students," February 1983.

Grubb Institute, *Freedom to Study,* Overseas Students Trust, 1978.

Overseas Development Administration, *British Aid to Education in Developing Countries,* Overseas Development Paper No, 22, London: Her Majesty's Printing Office, 1982.

Williams, Peter, "Britain's Full-Cost Regime for Overseas Students," *Comparative Education Review,* Vol. 28 No. 2, May, 1984.

Williams, Peter, *A Policy for Overseas Students: Analysis, Options, Proposals,* Overseas Students Trust, May 1982.

Williams, Peter, ed., *The Overseas Student Question: Studies for a Policy,* London: Heinemann for the Overseas Students Trust, 1981.

France:

Jarousse, Jean-Pierre, Smith, Alan, and Woesler, Christine, *Les Etudiants Etrangers: Comparaison Internationale des flux et des politiques, 1960-1980),* Institut Européen d'Education et de Politique Sociale, 1982.

Ministère de l'Education Nationale, *Etudiants Etrangers,* mimeographed, no date.

Ministère de l'Education Nationale, "Statistiques des Etudiants de Nationalité Etrangère dans les Universités 1981-82, *Note d'Information,* 22 November 1982.

Germany:

Danckwortt, Dieter, *Cooperation with Developing Countries in the Federal Republic of Germany, An Organizational Survey*, German Foundation for International Development, 1978.

Danckwortt, Dieter, "Theory and Practice of Intercultural Manpower Exchange in the Federal Republic of Germany," mimeographed, 1983.

Federal Ministry of Education and Science, *Higher Education in the Federal Republic of Germany*, 1982.

Federal Republic of Germany, *Facts About Germany*, Lexikothek Verlag, 3rd. ed., 1981.

German Academic Exchange Service, *Aims, Programme, Functions*, 1982.

Roeloffs, Karl, "Policy Toward Foreign Students," mimeographed lecture, 1983.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Philip M. Phibbs, President
University of Puget Sound, *Chair*

Leon E. Boothe, President
Northern Kentucky University

Alice Chandler, President
State University of New York
College at New Paltz

Elizabeth T. Kennan, President
Mount Holyoke College

Maxwell C. King, President
Brevard Community College

Leslie Koltai, Chancellor
Los Angeles Community College

Richard Krasno, President
Institute of International Education

Theodore E. Lobman, Program Officer
The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation

C. Peter Magrath, President
University of Missouri

Dennis J. Murray, President
Marist College

Benjamin F. Payton, President
Tuskegee Institute, *ACE Board Representative*

Helen Popovich, President
Florida Atlantic University

Frank H. T. Rhodes, President
Cornell University

Walter Rosenblith, Institute Professor
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Irving Shain, Chancellor
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Arnold Shore, Senior Program Officer
Exxon Education Foundation

Donald M. Stewart, President
Spelman College

Frank E. Vandiver, President
Texas A & M University

Donald E. Walters, President
Montclair State College

Robert E. Ward, Director
Center for Research in
International Studies
Stanford University